The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 19, Number 3 www.ihr.org May/June 2000

The 13th IHR Conference: A Resounding Success

'Conference of the Persecuted': Keynote Address

Mark Weber

New Treblinka Investigation Finds No Mass Graves

Revisionist Thesis Furor in New Zealand

ADL Loses Big Defamation Case

Three Letters to *Le Monde*

Robert Faurisson

On Prejudice, the 'Jewish Question,' and Communism's Legacy

Joseph Sobran

The Irving Trial, 'Human Rights' Double Standard, and Jewish-Zionist Arrogance

Doug Collins

— Review —

'Nuremberg' TV Drama

Greg Raven

— And More —

The Unsurpassed Standard Refutation

THE HOAX OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The Case Against the Presumed Extermination of European Jewry



Yehuda Bauer and Prof. Moshe Davis agreed that there is a "recession in guilt feeling" over the Holocaust, encouraged by fresh arguments that the reported extermination of six million Jews during World War II never took place ... "You know, it's not difficult to fabricate history," Davis added.

— Chicago *Sun-Times,* Oct. 25, 1977

In spite of the many important breakthroughs in revisionist scholarship since it was first published in 1976, Dr. Butz' brilliant pathbreaking study remains unsurpassed as the most comprehensive one-volume scholarly refutation of the Holocaust extermination story.

With an engineer's eye for technical detail and a mature scholar's mastery of the sources, the Northwestern University professor ranges from Auschwitz to Zyklon in debunking the gas chamber and the Six Million stories.

In nearly 400 pages of penetrating analysis and lucid commentary, Dr. Butz gives a graduate course on the fate of Europe's Jews during the Second World War. He scrupulously separates the cold facts from the tonnage of stereotyped myth and propaganda that has served as a formidable barrier to the truth for more than half a century.

Chapter by solidly referenced chapter, Butz applies the scholar's rigorous technique to every major aspect of the Six Million legend, carefully explaining his startling conclusion that "the Jews of Europe were not exterminated and there was no German attempt to exterminate them."

Focusing on the postwar "war crimes trials," where the prosecution's evidence was falsified and secured by coercion and even torture, Butz re-examines the very German records so long misrepresented. He re-evaluates the concept and technical feasibility of the legendary extermination gas chambers. Reviewing the demographic statistics, which do not allow for the loss of six million European Jews, he concludes that perhaps a million may have perished in the turmoil of deportation, internment and war.

Maligned by persons who have made no effort to read it, bitterly denounced by those unable to refute its thesis, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* has sent shock waves through the academic and political world. So threatening has it been to Zionist interests and the international Holocaust lobby that its open sale has been banned in several countries, including Israel and Germany.

In three important supplements included in this edition, the author reports on key aspects of the still unfolding global Holocaust controversy.

Now in its *tenth* US printing, this classic, semi-underground best seller remains the most widely read revisionist work on the subject. It is must reading for anyone who wants a clear picture of the scope and magnitude of the historical cover-up of the age.

Arthur R. Butz was born and raised in New York City. He received his Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees in Electrical Engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 1965 he received his doctorate in Control Sciences from the University of Minnesota. In 1966 he joined the faculty of Northwestern University (Evanston, Illinois), where he is now Associate Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering. Dr. Butz is the author of numerous technical papers. Since 1980 he has been a member of the Editorial Advisory Committee of *The Journal of Historical Review,* published by the Institute for Historical Review.

The Hoax of the Twentieth Century
by Arthur Butz

Quality Softcover Edition • 397 pages. Maps. Photographs. Source notes. Bibliography. Index. (#0301)
$14.45 postpaid (CA sales tax $ .97)
(foreign orders add $1.00 for shipping)

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Editor: Mark Weber
Associate Editors: Greg Raven
Theodore J. O'Keefe

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Advisors are not spokesmen of
the educational institutions identified.

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D
Los Angeles Unified School District (ret.)

ENRIQUE AYNAT, L.L.B.
Torreblanca, Spain

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JOHN BENNETT, L.L.B.
Australian Civil Liberties Union
Melbourne, Australia

ALEXANDER V. BERKIS, L.L.M., Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Electrical
and Computer Engineering
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan
Columbia, South Carolina

ROBERT H. COUNTESS, Ph.D.
Huntsville, Alabama

ALBERT J. ECKSTEIN, Ph.D.
Santa Fe Springs, California

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
Professor of French Literature (ret.)
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

GEORG FRANZ-WILLING, Ph.D.
Überlingen, Germany

JÜRGEN GRAF
Basel, Switzerland

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
The Agorist Institute
Beverly Hills, California

R. CLARENCE LANG, Ph.D., M. Div.
Seguin, Texas

JAMES MARTIN, Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Colorado Springs, Colorado

CARLO MATTOGNO
Rome, Italy

HIDEO MIKI
Professor of History (ret.)
National Defense Academy
Yokosuka, Japan

OLEG PLATONOV, Ph.D.
Moscow, Russia

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Glücksburg, Germany

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
Head, Dept. of Modern Languages (ret.)
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

C. ZAVERDINOS, Ph.D.
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 19, Number 3 May / June 2000

IN THIS ISSUE

Thirteenth IHR Conference: A Resounding Success 2

'The Conference of the Persecuted': Keynote Address 12
Mark Weber

Anti-Defamation League Suffers Major Legal Defeat 18

Treblinka Ground Radar Finds No Trace of Mass Graves 20

Revisionist Master's Thesis Under Fire 21

German Professor, Accused of Revisionism, Commits Suicide 24

Polish Professor Fired for Dissident History Book 25

The Irving Trial, 'Human Rights' Double Standard, and Jewish-Zionist Arrogance 27
Doug Collins

On Prejudice, the 'Jewish Question,' and Communism's Legacy 31
Joseph Sobran

Three Letters to *Le Monde* (1978-1979) 40
Robert Faurisson

From Its Beginning, Israeli Policy Promoted War, Not Peace 48
Donald Neff

'Nuremberg' Made-for-TV Movie 53
A review by Greg Raven

Letters 56

On the cover: Speakers at the 13th IHR Conference, May 27-29, 2000. Standing, left to right: Glayde Whitney, Bradley Smith, John Sack, Robert Countess, Germar Rudolf, Charles Provan, Theodore O'Keefe, Ernst Zündel, Greg Raven and Jürgen Graf. Seated, left to right: Fredrick Toben, Robert Faurisson, Arthur Butz, Mark Weber and John Bennett. Not shown here are Pete McCloskey and David Irving.

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the tradition of Historical Revisionism of scholars such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A.J.P. Taylor, William H. Chamberlin, Paul Rassinier and Charles Tansill. *The Journal of Historical Review* is published six times yearly by the **Institute for Historical Review,** P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659. Subscription price: $40 per year, $65 for two years, and $90 for three years. For foreign subscriptions, add $10 per year. For overseas airmail delivery, add $30 per year. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in US dollars drawable on a US bank. Donations to the IHR are tax-deductible.

Single copies of most *Journal* issues published since Spring 1986 (Volume 7) are available for $7.50 each, plus $2.00 shipping. Ask about the availability of specific issues. Hardbound annual volumes of the *Journal* for the years 1984, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993 are also available for $40.00 each, plus $3.50 shipping. Write for our booklist and prices.

Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor. They should be double-spaced and accompanied by return postage. Especially welcome are submissions on diskette. Send all correspondence to **P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659**. E-mail to: ihr@ihr.org. Web site: http://www.ihr.org.

The Journal of Historical Review is listed in standard periodical directories. Contributions do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Historical Review.

All rights reserved. Except for specifically copyrighted items, permission is hereby given to reprint material from this issue of the *Journal*, provided that no changes or alterations are made without prior arrangement, and providing that the following attribution appears with the material: "Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA. Subscriptions: $40 per year (domestic)." A copy of the reprint should be sent to the Editor.

13th IHR Conference: A Resounding Success

Optimism, Confidence Mark International Revisionist Meeting

A landmark meeting, characterized by confidence and optimism, brought together scholars, activists and friends of the Institute for Historical Review over the weekend of May 27-29, 2000. Some 150 men and women — some flying in from as far away as Australia, Argentina, Chile, Switzerland and Finland, as well as from across the United States — met in a spirit of continuity and renewal at a pleasant hotel in Irvine, southern California.

This 13th IHR Conference, by all accounts a resounding success, and perhaps the most spirited and successful ever, featured leading figures in the international revisionist movement. The forthright banquet talk by former Congressman Pete McCloskey and the rousing address by British historian David Irving were probably the most memorable high points of the three-day meeting. Four of the featured speakers — Robert Faurisson, Arthur Butz, John Bennett and Ernst Zündel — had addressed the very first IHR Conference in 1979, and one attendee — Harvey Taylor — had been at all 13 IHR conferences.

This Conference not only had more featured speakers than any previous IHR meeting — 17 in all — it also had more students and younger people in attendance. Also, more students than ever were given financial assistance to attend. An unusually high portion of attendees, perhaps 30 to 40 percent, had never before been to an IHR conference. Appropriately for a meeting held over Memorial Day weekend, quite a few of those attending were US armed forces veterans.

Bringing together attendees and speakers from a wide range of political leanings and varied ethnic and religious backgrounds was a common passion for intellectual freedom and truthful history, scorn for the enemies of free thought and expression, and a healthy skepticism of dogmatic or "official" history.

As usual, this was an ideal opportunity for like-minded men and women from near and far to compare experiences and exchange views. Some remained engrossed in conversations until well into the early morning hours. This year's Conference was unmarred by disruption or incident. Given the attacks by Jewish activists against past IHR meetings, the precise location of this Conference was not made public. (In 1989, for example, the Jewish Defense League used threats, intimidation and harassment to force the IHR from two hotels.)

Live Internet Broadcast

This was the best publicized IHR gathering ever. For the first time, lectures were broadcast live over the Internet through the **www.Revisionism.com** web site. (Links to the recordings can be found at the IHR's web site, **www.ihr.org**.) While some 400 people listened in on the first evening, this number grew rapidly over the next few days. Altogether some 4,445 people tuned in to live or recorded lectures between May 27 and June 2. So many were listening at one point that the main server carrying the broadcast crashed on the third day. However, people were still able to listen through an alternate server.

Unprecedented Media Coverage

For the first time ever, a major daily paper closely covered an IHR meeting. Veteran *Los Angeles Times* journalist Kim Murphy attended nearly every lecture, producing a rather detailed report, 40 column inches in length, that included apt quotes from addresses by Irving and McCloskey, and four paragraphs of excerpts from IHR Director Mark Weber's keynote address. Murphy's report was read not only by hundreds of thousands of *Times* readers when it appeared on May 30, but many others learned about the IHR and its conference when a lengthy portion of her article appeared in other daily papers.

A leading Israeli daily, The *Jerusalem Post* (June 1), also reported on the IHR Conference in an item based largely on the *Los Angeles Times* piece. In the meeting's aftermath, Weber conducted interviews with the leftist Los Angeles radio station KPFK and the Los Angeles bureau of the Reuters news agency.

Because it was unusually informative and generally objective, Murphy's *Times* report predictably enraged Jewish community figures. "Once again," complained Michael Berenbaum, a prominent Jewish activist and a former US Holocaust Memorial Council official, "the *Los Angeles Times* has allowed itself to be used as a propaganda instrument for Holocaust denial [sic] ..." The *Times* story, Berenbaum went on, "portrays the deniers [sic] as persecuted lambs who are harassed because of their ideas ... It can't seem to get the story right..."

Two southern California Jewish community



Conference speakers. Standing (left to right): Glayde Whitney, Bradley Smith, John Sack, Robert Countess, Germar Rudolf, Charles Provan, Theodore O'Keefe, Ernst Zündel, Greg Raven and Jürgen Graf. Seated (left to right): Fredrick Toben, Robert Faurisson, Arthur Butz, Mark Weber and John Bennett. Not shown here are Pete McCloskey and David Irving.

weekly papers — the Los Angeles *Jewish Journal* and *Heritage / Southwest Jewish Press* — responded to the *Times* report with fury bordering on hysteria. *Heritage* called the IHR Conference a meeting of "cuckoos," "Nazis" and "narcissistic psychopaths" who gathered to "exchange fulminations, conspiracies, delusions and lies." The Jewish weekly blasted the IHR as a "Nazi front," and lashed out at the *Los Angeles Times* as a "towering monument to journalistic arrogance, incompetence, bias and stonewalling."

Murphy, a seasoned *Times* journalist with an impressive record covering the Middle East and the Bosnia war, had also written a generally fair front-page piece (January 7) on the Irving trial that, for the first time ever, informed readers of a major American daily paper of the routine legal persecution in Europe of revisionists. She cited specific cases of dissidents in Germany, France and other countries who have been imprisoned, fined or driven into exile merely for challenging official historiography.

Michael Shermer, editor-publisher of the anti-revisionist *Skeptic* magazine, attended a few of the Conference lectures. He is the co-author, along with veteran Jewish-Zionist activist Alex Grobman, of a just-published anti-revisionist polemic, *Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say It?* (University of California Press).

Greg Raven, *Journal* associate editor, opened the Conference on Saturday evening with a formal welcome to attendees and speakers. Then, as MC, he capably kept the proceedings on track during the next two days with succinct, informative and witty introductions.

Pete McCloskey

"I came because I respect the thesis of this organization," said former Congressman Paul (Pete) McCloskey, Jr., "that thesis being that there should be a reexamination of whatever governments say or politicians say or political entities say." In his Sunday evening banquet address, the one-time federal lawmaker from northern California spoke bluntly about the corrupting role of Jewish-Zionist special interest groups, especially the powerful Anti-Defamation League.

Jewish leaders promptly denounced McCloskey's participation in the Conference. Rabbi Abraham Cooper of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, for example, said that his "appearance under the same tent as someone who has just been crowned the leading intellectual Jew-hater in the world [Irving], I guess speaks volumes."

McCloskey spoke in some detail about the ADL's record of illicit spying activities against groups deemed harmful to Israeli interests. The ADL, he noted, secretly arranged with officials of major metropolitan police departments to exchange unlaw-



John Sack

ference of the persecuted," with several of the speakers having been imprisoned, fined, beaten, dismissed, and banned for expressing dissident views on 20th century history. He went on to highlight the powerful Jewish-Zionist forces behind the worldwide campaign of intimidation, persecution and censorship to enforce what amounts to a Jewish view of history. "We are expected to look at US and world history from what, in truth, is a Jewish perspective," said Weber.

"How a society views history both reflects and greatly helps to determine its essential values and priorities," he said. "How we view the past is crucially important in determining how we view ourselves, our place in the world, and, more important, our future as a people or society." Citing specific, telling examples, he explained how our view of history has been drastically skewed over the past century.

Speaking of the devastating six-year-old legal dispute caused by the embezzlement of millions of dollars from the IHR and its parent corporation, Weber said that "the Institute has weathered the storm." He spoke of the future with confidence. After six belt-tightening years, he said, the IHR is now rebuilding. This Conference, he added, is an expression of that renewal.

Weber concluded by stressing the Institute's determination to carry on, "with greater clarity and sense of purpose than ever... our educational work of truth in history, for the sake not only of our own nation and heritage, but for all humanity."

John Sack

In a dramatically delivered and information-packed lecture, John Sack traced the origins and impact of *An Eye for an Eye*, his headline-making exposé of the brutal mistreatment of ethnic Germans by Jewish Communist authorities in postwar Poland. The book — now available from the IHR in an expanded and thoroughly referenced new edition — explains that 60,000 to 80,000 Germans perished in the 1,255 concentration camps operated in Communist-ruled Poland by the notorious "Office of State Security," and that three-fourths of its officers were Jews.

The veteran journalist and author related his adventures in censorship at the hands of the US Holocaust Memorial Museum and other enemies of open discourse. He said that the World Jewish Congress called him, and his US publisher, "anti-Semites" (even though he is Jewish himself). During an interview on the nationally-broadcast "Charlie Rose" television show, Sack said, Deborah Lipstadt called him an "anti-Semite" and a "neo-Nazi." And during a one-on-one telephone conversation, he related, Lipstadt told him that he is "worse than a Holocaust denier."



Robert Faurisson

During a question and answer period, Sack was asked when Jewish groups such as the ADL might permit a Holocaust revisionist to address their meetings. To everyone's delight, he responded: "They won't even let *me* speak!"

Sack affirmed that he accepts that Jews were killed in gas chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau and other wartime German camps. His participation at this IHR conference thus discredits the often-made charge that the Institute for Historical Review is ideologically dogmatic, sectarian or anti-Jewish.

Robert Faurisson

"Revisionism is not an ideology, it is a method," stressed Robert Faurisson, the French professor who for decades has been Europe's foremost revisionist scholar. In his well-received address, Dr. Faurisson called for a revisionism that is bold, daring and severe, a "nuts and bolts revisionism" that "goes to the center of the question." Revisionist scholarship, he went on, should be free of pedantry.

Faurisson brought to the podium the insight, wit and savvy of a scholar who was educated at the Paris Sorbonne, and who served for years as a professor at the University of Lyon II. His groundbreaking writings and courageous advocacy of Holocaust revisionism have resulted in academic sanctions, endless trials and murderous assaults.

Faurisson also spoke about the Anne Frank diary, relating his first-person interview with Otto Frank, Anne's father, at his home in Switzerland in 1977, and responded to the "definitive" version of the diary published in 1989 by the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation.

Germar Rudolf

Speaking with authority based on bitter personal experience, Germar Rudolf reported on the growing legal repression of dissidents in Germany. Between 1994 and 1999, he related, 58,000 persons were prosecuted in Germany for "thought crimes." In 1999 there were 11,248 such prosecutions, of which 8,698 were "right wing" violations, 1,015 were "leftist," and 1,525 involved foreigners or non-German issues.

Among recent German efforts to curtail human and civil rights, Rudolf cited attempts to curb access to supposedly subversive Internet materials. He also spoke of the country's insidious "youth protection" measures. While ostensibly designed to "protect youth," they are largely a pretext for ideologically-driven censorship. "Germany today is a totalitarian police state," said Rudolf, adding that freedom is similarly restricted in Austria.

The 35-year-old German-born chemist, a leading representative of a younger generation of revisionist scholars and activists, was forced into exile in

Germar Rudolf (left) with Greg Raven

1996 after being sentenced to 14 months imprisonment for his critical on-site forensic examination of the Auschwitz and Birkenau "gas chambers" (the "Rudolf Report"). Since 1997 he has been editor of the German-language revisionist journal, *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*.

Rudolf spoke of the strong (Jewish) religious-ethnic or ideological prejudices of Robert Jan Van Pelt, a prominent defense witness in the Irving-Lipstadt London trial who is now widely regarded as a world-class expert on German wartime "gas chambers." In "Mr. Death," the recent documentary (by Jewish film maker Errol Morris), Van Pelt spoke of Auschwitz-Birkenau as the "holy of holies," and of World War II as a "moral war ... a war between good and evil," and that "the core of this war... is Auschwitz." ("Mr. Death" is reviewed in the Sept.-Dec. 1999 *Journal*, pp. 62-69.) Rudolf also mentioned important new documents about Auschwitz-Birkenau found by Italian researcher and author Carlo Mattogno.

Of his own decision to carry out a forensic investigation of Auschwitz-Birkenau, an undertaking that he knew might well upset his life, Rudolf said that he first hesitated, asking himself "Why me?" But he then asked himself "Why not me?," and resolved to go ahead.

Ernst Zündel

In October Graf will begin serving the 15-month prison sentence that was handed down in July 1998 for his "thought crime" violations of Switzerland's recent "anti-racism" law. (See "Swiss Court Punishes Two Revisionists," July-August 1998 *Journal*, pp. 2-13.)

He prefers to serve the outrageous sentence rather than go into political exile and lead the life of a fugitive (as Germar Rudolf has done).

John Bennett

Since the late 1970s, John Bennett has been a leading voice for revisionism in Australia, where he is also well known as a staunch defender of civil liberties. Copies were made available to attendees of the most recent edition of his widely-distributed handbook, *Your Rights*, which often contains revisionist material. Bennett made comments and offered suggestions based on his years of experience. For one thing, he said, he would welcome more humorous treatment of Holocaust claims, especially the obviously ludicrous ones.

Bradley Smith

Bradley Smith, veteran of hundreds of radio and television appearances, brought attendees up-to-date on his work in bringing revisionism to America's colleges and universities. In his usual genial manner, Smith told how his ad campaign and new magazine, *The Revisionist*, have shaken up one campus after another across the country, enraging the traditional self-appointed censors.

Robert Countess

Robert Countess, scholar and revisionist ambassador, provided an enthusiastic and anecdote-filled report about his globe-trotting activism, including insights from his role in the recent international Holocaust conference in Stockholm. He also spoke about his role in helping to produce the forthcoming English-language anthology of revisionist writings, *Dissecting the Holocaust*, compiled and edited by Germar Rudolf. During the Conference, he promoted new "No holes, No Holocaust" T-shirts.

Ernst Zündel

Canada's leading revisionist activist spoke with his usual verve and passion about his seemingly unending struggle for freedom of expression and truth in history in his adopted homeland. Twice Zündel was brought to trial in two history-making "Holocaust trials," but was ultimately vindicated only when the country's Supreme Court threw out as unconstitutional the archaic "false news" law under which he had been prosecuted.

Holding forth in his typically upbeat and irrepressible style, Ernst Zündel delighted attendees with a vivid report on the latest political and judicial efforts to silence him and the California-based "Zündelsite" web site operated by Ingrid Rimland. Speaking optimistically about the future, the prominent German-Canadian civil rights figure provided apt observations on the recent Irving-Lipstadt trial in London, and on the much-publicized 1999 documentary film "Mr. Death" (about Fred Leuchter, whose forensic examination of Auschwitz he commissioned for his 1988 trial in Toronto).

"Our job now is to ring the bell for freedom for as long as we can," Zündel said. "The ghetto will not win!," he concluded defiantly.

Charles Provan

Charles Provan, independent researcher and author, presented a lively dissection of the "testimony" of Dr. Miklos Nyiszli, a physician at Auschwitz-Birkenau whose memoir has been



At the Conference (left to right): Robert Faurisson, John Bennett, Ernst Zündel, Bradley Smith and Fredrick Toben

Mark Weber delivers the Conference keynote address.

not even come into popular usage until the 1970s.

In this drastic re-writing of history, the fate and role of Jews is a paramount consideration. Michael Berenbaum, one-time Research Director of the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, and a Georgetown University theology professor, put it this way several years ago: "The Holocaust was [once] regarded as a side story of the much larger story of World War II. Now one thinks of World War II as a background story and the Holocaust as a foreground story."[1]

We are often asked why we seem obsessed with "the Holocaust." The answer is very simple. As any child can easily observe, it is not revisionists or the IHR who are fixated on the fate — 55 or 60 years ago — of a small minority of the population of a foreign continent. It is, rather, our own political, social and intellectual leaders who have made the fate of Europe's Jews during World War II a central icon of our age. We deal with the Holocaust as we do because it has come to play a major, even crucial role in our society.

If anyone in 1950 or even 1960 had predicted that by the end of this century political leaders of the United States and other major countries, even Germany, would routinely be honoring something called "the Holocaust" or "the Shoah," he would have been dismissed as delusional. But so swiftly and drastically have things changed that by 1992 Israeli Holocaust historian Yehuda Bauer, a professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, was moved to declare:[2]

> Whether presented authentically or inauthentically, in accordance with the historical facts or in contradiction to them, with empathy and understanding or as monumental kitsch, the Holocaust has become a ruling symbol of our culture... Hardly a month goes by without a new TV production, a new film, a new drama, new books, prose or poetry, dealing with the subject, and the flood is increasing rather than abating.

Since 1993 we have even had, in Washington, DC, an official, taxpayer-funded United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, run by a federal government agency, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum — a mighty expression of, and a monument to, Jewish power.[3] There is no comparable US museum dedicated, for example, to the vastly greater numbers of victims of Soviet tyranny, or to the victims of slavery.

Jewish scholar and rabbi Michael Goldberg, in his book *Why Should Jews Survive?*, wrote with insight about what he calls "the Holocaust cult," a cult with "its own tenets of faith, rites and shrines."[4] No less a figure than Abraham Foxman, national director of the Zionist Anti-Defamation League, has affirmed the iconic, even religious character of this cult. In a 1994 issue of the ADL newsletter, Foxman wrote: "The Holocaust is a singular event. It is not simply one example of genocide but a near successful attempt on the life of God's chosen children and thus, on God himself."[5] When one starts talking like this, one is no longer dealing with history, but rather has crossed over into dogmatic mysticism.

No comparable attention is given to the tens of millions of other World War II victims, including, for example, the many millions of Chinese who perished in the war. Largely forgotten in this cult of the Holocaust have been the tens of millions of victims of America's great wartime ally, Stalinist Russia, along with the tens of millions of victims of China's Maoist regime, as well as the 12 to 14 million Germans, victims of the flight and expulsion of 1944-1949, of whom some two million lost their lives.

We are expected to look at US and world history from what, in truth, is a Jewish perspective.

One can tell the real values and priorities of a society by what it prohibits. As several of those here in this room this evening can attest from personal experience, what our society — and by this I mean the United States and most of Europe, as well as Japan — forbids is anything deemed to be anti-Semitic. What is particularly prohibited in our "new world order" is any questioning or playing down of what has become the most sacred icon of our age — the Jewish "Holocaust" or "Shoah."

From the late 1940s until the 1970s, the official, or at least prevailing view was that the dreadful Nazi regime was more or less foisted on the basically decent people of Germany, Austria, and other European countries by Hitler and his evil hench-

Jürgen Graf and Mark Weber in conversation during a break.

men. However, since the late 1970s, and especially during the past decade, this has changed drastically. Now the prevailing, socially-sanctioned view is that Nazism (or even less accurately, "fascism") — by which we are supposed to understand, above all, the harsh suppression of Europe's Jews in the 1930s and 1940s — was supported, or at least passively tolerated, by nearly the entire Western world.

The supposed "guilt" for what is often characterized as the most evil deed in history is now routinely ascribed to, not only the great majority of Germans (a view most outspokenly presented by Jewish academic Daniel Goldhagen in his hateful book *Hitler's Willing Executioners*) but to virtually all of non-Jewish humanity. Entire nations, we are now told, must acknowledge a collective responsibility, even a collective guilt or complicity, for this allegedly greatest of all human crimes. Excepting only a small number of such "righteous gentiles" as Oskar Schindler, the Germans, the Poles, the Hungarians, the Ukrainians, the French, and so forth, are held to be historically responsible for the "Shoah." In one of the most amazing re-writings of history, even Pope Pius XII and the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church are held to share in this common guilt.

History or historiography is, of course, an academic pursuit, a specialized field of scholarship. But it is also much more than that. How a society views history both reflects and greatly helps to determine its essential values and priorities. How we view the past is crucially important in determining how we view ourselves, our place in the world, and, more important, our future as a people or society. As Oswald Spengler put it "history lessons and the political education of the people are one and the same."

In this sense, "history" is not and cannot be "neutral." Different groups understandably look at the past from very different perspectives. In a valuable book published some years ago, *America Revised*, historian Frances Fitzgerald explained not only how our common perspective on American history has changed radically over the past half century, but how it is impossible to portray American history in a way that is "positive" and coherent for all of America's diverse population groups.[6]

The history books now being produced for use in American colleges and universities both reflect and help to shape the "politically correct" spirit of our age. Typical is a new book by Cornell University history professor Richard Polenberg, *The Era Of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1933-1945*.[7] Polenberg praises Roosevelt for his supposed commitment to moral principles and his "pragmatism." But he also criticizes FDR for his failure to do more "to advance the cause of racial justice," and for his wartime internment of West Coast Japanese. And, of course, Polenberg subjects Roosevelt to special criticism for his not doing more on behalf of Europe's Jews. While the book devotes five pages to what the index calls "Jews, government response to Holocaust," it contains just a single, neutral mention, and only in passing, to Stalin — Roosevelt's important wartime ally. Readers of this all-too-typical book can easily be forgiven for failing to appreciate the crucially important historical role played at the time by Stalin and Soviet Russia. Polenberg similarly ignores Roosevelt's well-documented record of lying on a massive and routine scale to the American public, his covert, unconstitutional war-mongering, his friendship with the Soviet dictator, or the massive US material and military support for the Soviet war machine.

During the past 20th century, we have witnessed an unbelievably enormous increase in Jewish power and influence everywhere in the world. It was in 1896 that Theodor Herzl, the founder of the modern Zionist movement, published his seminal book *Der Judenstaat* ("The Jewish State"), in which he argued that Jews around the world constitute a *Volk*, that is, a people or nationality, with interests different than those of the non-Jews among whom they live. (Consistent with that, Israeli political figures and Jewish community leaders in the United States routinely speak of "the Jewish people.") And a year later, in 1897, Herzl convened the First Zionist Congress in Basel, Switzerland. Five decades later — in May 1948 — the Zionist state of Israel was proclaimed in Palestine. Today, armed even with nuclear weapons, Israel is one of the world's

most important military powers. What an amazing expression of resolve, determination and power that achievement represents!

Just how important is this Jewish power and influence today? Well, as early as 1968 the renowned drama critic Walter Kerr could declare in *The New York Times*:[8]

> What has happened since World War II is that the American mentality has become part Jewish, perhaps as much Jewish as anything else ... The literate American mind has come in some measure to think Jewishly. It has been taught to, and it was ready to. After the entertainers and novelists came the Jewish critics, politicians and theologians. Critics and politicians and theologians are by profession molders; they form ways of seeing.

As accurate as those words were when they were written more than 30 years ago, they are vastly more true today. In a book published in 1995, *Jews and the New American Scene*, two well-known Jewish writers, Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, noted:[9]

> During the last three decades Jews [in the United States] have made up 50 percent of the top two hundred intellectuals ... 20 percent of professors at the leading universities ... 40 percent of partners in the leading law firms in New York and Washington ... 59 percent of the directors, writers, and producers of the 50 top-grossing motion pictures from 1965 to 1982, and 58 percent of directors, writers, and producers in two or more primetime television series.

And even more recently, the prominent French Jewish writer Alain Finkielkraut, writing in late 1998 in the prestigious Paris daily *Le Monde*, had this to say:[10]

> Ah, how sweet it is to be Jewish at the end of this 20th century! We are no longer History's accused, but its darlings. The spirit of the times loves, honors, and defends us, watches over our interests; it even needs our imprimatur. Journalists draw up ruthless indictments against all that Europe still has in the way of Nazi collaborators or those nostalgic for the Nazi era. Churches repent, states do penance ...

Consistent with this, Jewish power enforces a pervasive double standard in our political and cultural life. While Jews are encouraged to cultivate and promote their peoplehood and particular group interests, Westerners are expected to accept, even embrace, their own collective racial-cultural dispossession. Thus, while Jewish leaders routinely



Greg Raven, Conference MC, displays the new, revised edition of John Sack's *An Eye for An Eye*.

express alarm that so many Jews are marrying non-Jews, a comparable attitude if expressed by non-Jews is swiftly denounced as "racist." (Just recently, for example, a professor at Bar-Ilan University in Israel bluntly declared that intermarriage "violates the most basic norms of Judaism [and] threatens Jewish survival.")[11]

Benjamin Netanyahu, until recently Israel's prime minister, just last February addressed a gathering of nearly a thousand Jews here in southern California, in which he said: "If Israel had not come into existence after World War II then I am certain the Jewish race wouldn't have survived."[12] The Israeli leader went on to exhort his audience: "I stand before you and say you must strengthen your commitment to Israel. You must become leaders and stand up as Jews. We must be proud of our past to be confident of our future." Similarly forthright appeals by non-Jews to racial-ethnic pride are, of course, routinely condemned as "racist" or "neo-Nazi." As a matter of basic state policy, Israel actively encourages immigration of Jews — defined by ancestry — from around the world, while at the same time discouraging settlement by non-Jews, even forbidding immigration of non-Jews who were born in what is now Israel.

Can this awesome Jewish power become any greater than it already is? Unfortunately, there are

Mark Weber, holding his two-year-old son, Andrew, in conversation with Jürgen Graf.

signs that the situation can get even worse.

During the recent libel trial in London, David Irving performed a great public service by presenting to the world details of just how international Jewish organizations work together to silence and ruin those who, like Irving, are perceived, because of their writings, to threaten Jewish interests. One of the most ominous consequences of Judge Gray's April 11 ruling in the Irving-Lipstadt trial, I think, is that it has greatly emboldened these powerful enemies of free speech, strengthening their resolve to destroy their intellectual adversaries. For example, one high-level Zionist official, in the aftermath of the ruling, called for what amounts to a worldwide ban on travel by those who dispute Holocaust extermination claims. Israel's ambassador to Britain, Dror Zeigerman, called on Australia and other countries to bar Irving and "other members of the Holocaust denial movement."[13]

The recent Irving-Lipstadt trial also showed, once again and with clarity, that behind this ruthless international Jewish campaign is a deep-seated, implacable hatred. At a recent meeting in Los Angeles, Deborah Lipstadt herself called David Irving "a contemporary Amalek," referring to the traditional biblical foe of the Jews.[14] Similarly, in an essay about the trial distributed worldwide by a major Jewish news agency, a Jewish academic who teaches at Gratz College near Philadelphia wrote: "Deborah Lipstadt's work reminds us, as the Torah does in its passage about Amalek, of the importance of memory. In my opinion, it is David Irving and his *ilk* who should beware."[15]

For devout Jews, such words are very serious. According to the Torah,[16] the Jewish god called on the ancient Hebrews to "smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and women, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." Accordingly, we are told, the early Jews "utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword." Even today, Jews are admonished never to forget their emblematic enemy, and to wage "war with Amalek from generation to generation" — that is, forever. The obvious inference here is that Irving and "his ilk" deserve to be killed.

In this same spirit, a high-ranking Israeli government official publicly suggested, in the wake of Judge Gray's April 11 ruling, that those whom he calls "Holocaust deniers" deserve to be put to death. Rabbi Michael Melchior, Israel's Minister "for Israeli Society and World Jewish Communities," said that Judge Gray's ruling "delivered the message that Holocaust deniers should be regarded alongside the worst of the Nazis."[17] As the world knows, of course, "the worst of the Nazis" were shot or hanged.

The Institute for Historical Review and our supporters openly declare our defiance of the ADL, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, the World Jewish Congress, and so forth — and all their non-Jewish helpers. Against their power the IHR stands, and will continue to stand, as a beacon and a bulwark, not only for truth and reason in understanding the past, but for sanity in tackling the challenges of the future.

While we are confident that the march of revisionist scholarship is ultimately unstoppable, we are also encouraged by the knowledge that our adversaries' power is artificial and unrooted. It is built on an inherently unstable foundation of deceit and hypocrisy — something that is acknowledged, if only indirectly, by their constant expressions of anxiety that their power can and may be suddenly swept away.

To stand against this power is often thankless and disheartening work, but it is absolutely necessary. Our adversaries are enemies not only of freedom of speech and free historical inquiry, they also strive relentlessly to belittle and break down the cultural, religious, racial and ethnic integrity and cohesion of all groups other than their own. And because it attacks traits of our being that make us human, this insidious power harms all of non-Jewish humanity.

Exposing this insidious power — in its many manifestations — will continue to be a major task of the IHR. In this new century as well, we pledge to carry on — with greater clarity and sense of purpose than ever — our educational work of truth in history, for the sake not only of our own nation and heritage, but for all humanity.

Notes

1. *The Washington Times*, Jan. 10, 1991. Quoted in *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 1994, p. 44.
2. From a 1992 lecture, published in: David Cesarani, ed., *The Final Solution: Origins and Implementation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), pp. 305, 306. Also, quoted in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Sept.-Dec. 1999, p. 56.
3. On the occasion of the opening of the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, Jewish author and critic Melvin Jules Bukeit wrote: "It's not Jewish tragedy that's remembered on the Mall this week; it's Jewish power to which homage is paid." Melvin Jules Bukiet, "The Museum vs. Memory: The Taming of the Holocaust," *The Washington Post*, April 18, 1993, p. C3.
4. Michael Goldberg, *Why Should Jews Survive?: Looking Past the Holocaust Toward a Jewish Future* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1995), p. 41.

   See also: Tim Cole, *Selling the Holocaust: From Auschwitz to Schindler: How History is Bought, Packaged and Sold* (New York: Routledge, 1999), and, Peter Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life* (Houghton Mifflin, 1999).
5. Abraham Foxman, "Director's Corner: Schindler's List — The Meaning of Spielberg's Film," *On the Frontline* (ADL newsletter), Jan. 1994, p. 2. Also quoted in *The Journal of Historical Review*, March-April 1994, p. 41.
6. Frances Fitzgerald, *America Revised: History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1979 [and, New York: 1980]).
7. Richard D. Polenberg, *The Era Of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1933-1945: A Brief History With Documents* (New York: St. Martin's Press, [March] 2000). Polenberg is a professor of American history at Cornell University. He is the author of several books, and was once a visiting professor at Hebrew University in Israel.

   In April 1996 St. Martin's Press, with much fanfare and in response to tremendous Jewish pressure, cancelled its publication of David Irving's biography *Goebbels: Mastermind Of The Third Reich.*
8. Walter Kerr, "Skin Deep is not Good Enough," *The New York Times*, April 14, 1968, pp. D1, D3. Quoted in: Kevin MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique* (Praeger, 1998), p. 243. (Cited in the Sept.-Dec. 1999 *Journal of Historical Review*, p. 49.) Walter Kerr (1913-1996) was a playwright and Pulitzer prize-winning drama critic, for years with the New York *Herald Tribune* and then *The New York Times.*
9. Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, *Jews And The New American Scene* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1995), pp. 26-27. (Quoted in the Sept.-Dec. 1999 *Journal of Historical Review*, p. 56.)

   A 1985 study written by Lipset and Raab, "The Political Future of American Jews," found that Jews are effectively the single most influential ethnic or religious group in American political life. According to the study, which was sponsored by the American Jewish Congress, Jews contribute to political parties disproportionately to their numbers in the US population: Jews give more than half the money collected by the Democratic Party and up to a quarter of Republican funds. K. Sawyer, "Jews Cautioned on Narrow Issues," *The Washington Post*, March 6, 1985, p. A5.

   The influence of American Jewry in Washington is "far disproportionate to the size of the community, Jewish leaders and US official acknowledge. But so is the amount of money they contribute to [political] campaigns." One member of the influential Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations "estimated Jews alone had contributed 50 percent of the funds for Clinton's 1996 re-election campaign." Janine Zacharia, "The Unofficial Ambassadors of the Jewish State," *The Jerusalem Post* (Israel), April 2, 2000. Reprinted in "Other Voices," June 2000, a supplement to *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, June 2000, p. OV-4.
10. Alain Finkielkraut, "Mgr Stepinac et les deux douleurs de l'Europe," *Le Monde*, Oct. 7, 1998, p. 14. Quoted by Robert Faurisson in his essay in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Nov.-Dec. 1998, pp. 11-12.
11. *Los Angeles Times*, April 17, 2000, p. A14 R. The Bar-Ilan university professor is Charles S. Liebman.

    "...Policy recently handed down by the Conservative [Jewish] movement's rabbinical authorities" holds that "Judaism has, from its earliest roots, been concerned about the issue of intermarriage. Statements found in early sources are unequivocal in their prohibition of intermarriage." Fears that sharing food and drink with non-Jews could lead to intermarriage prompted prohibitions against drinking the wine of non-Jews or eating their bread. Source: E. Gootman, "Conservative Jewry...," *Forward* (New York), Oct. 16, 1998, pp. 1, 13.
12. "'Strengthen your commitment'," *Daily Pilot* (Newport Beach/ Costa Mesa, Calif.), Feb. 28, 2000, p. 1.
13. AAP dispatch, *The Australian*, April 13, 2000.
14. Tom Tugend, "Lipstadt Recounts Battle With 'Amalek'," *The Jerusalem Post*, May 2, 2000.
15. Rela Mintz Geffen, "First Person FOD (Friend of Deborah) exits trial believing Irving is one to 'beware'," Jewish Telegraphic Agency, March 21, 2000.
16. Exodus 17:16, Deuteronomy 25:17, 1 Samuel 15:3-20.
17. "Racist Who Twisted the Truth," *The Times* (London), Wed., April 12, 2000.

Moving?

Please notify us of your new address at least six weeks in advance. Send address change to:

IHR, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA.

Anti-Defamation League Suffers Major Legal Defeat

Colorado Jury Orders Jewish Group to Pay $10.5 Million for Defamatory Statements

In a legal decision rich with irony, a jury in a federal court case in Denver, Colorado, has found that the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), a powerful Jewish special interest group, had defamed a local couple. On April 28, 2000, the jurors awarded $10.5 million in damages to William and Dorothy Quigley. This is the first court verdict ever against the influential 87-year-old organization. The award, a quarter of the ADL's $45 million annual budget, was substantially more than the Quigleys had requested.

At a *1994 news* conference, the ADL had accused the Quigleys, a couple in the Denver suburb of Evergreen, of perpetrating the worst anti-Semitic incident in the area in ten years. The ADL accused them of launching a campaign against their Jewish neighbors, Mitchell and Candace Aronson, to run them out of town and threatening to commit acts such as painting oven doors on their neighbors' home. Concluding a four week trial, the jury found that more than 40 statements by Saul F. Rosenthal, director of the ADL's Mountain States chapter, were defamatory and "not substantially true."

The Quigleys, who are Roman Catholic, and the Aronsons — neighbors on the same street two houses away — got along until the Aronsons' large dog allegedly attacked the Quigley's smaller dog. As the dispute escalated, Mitchell Aronson tuned in a police scanner to eavesdrop on private conversations by the Quigleys over their cordless telephone. The Aronsons' nearly 100 hours of recorded telephone conversations violated the amended federal wiretap law, which makes it illegal to record conversations on a cordless telephone, to transcribe the material, and to use the transcriptions for any purpose.

The Aronsons sought help from the ADL, whose local director publicly denounced the Quigleys as anti-Semites. Director Rosenthal illegally used the tapes to charge at a news conference in December 1994 that the Quigleys were engaged in "a vicious anti-Semitic campaign." He expanded on these charges later that same day in an interview on a Denver radio talk show.

No overt acts or physical actions followed any of the recorded conversations.

Acting on complaints from the Aronsons, the local District Attorney filed ethnic intimidation charges against the Quigleys. But the county prosecutor later dropped the charges and, in an open letter, apologized to the couple, saying he had found no evidence that either had engaged in "anti-Semitic conduct or harassment." The DA also paid the Quigleys $75,000 as part of an out-of-court settlement.

Lawsuits by the Aronsons and the Quigleys against each other were eventually resolved, with no exchange of money.

In their lawsuit against the ADL and its local director, the Quigleys charged not only that the ADL had defamed them, but that the Jewish group was supportive of the illegal invasion of their privacy through its use of the improperly recorded telephone conversations.

During closing arguments, Quigley attorney Jay Horowitz said that while Dorothy Quigley had a "big mouth," and may have said things over the telephone that she later regretted, there is no evidence that the Quigleys were anti-Semites. When talking about damages suffered by the Quigleys, Horowitz noted that William Quigley, who was employed by United Artists theaters, was a marked man because of the ADL's public allegations of anti-Semitism. His income, Horowitz argued, was less than half of what it would have been.

The numerous damage awards include one million dollars in economic and non-economic damages for William Quigley and $500,000 for Dorothy Quigley. The couple was also awarded more than $8.7 million in punitive damages and other, lesser amounts.

The ADL is appealing the verdict, expressing confidence that the jury's award will be reduced, or even that the verdict will be thrown out altogether.

The *Washington Jewish Week*, a paper that serves the Jewish community of the nation's capital, commented with sympathetic concern in an editorial: "In a disturbing irony, the Jewish world's premier discrimination fighter, whose mission is 'to stop the defamation of the Jewish people and to secure justice and fair treatment for all people alike,' found itself convicted of defamation ... When does being in the forefront mean invading someone's personal privacy, and even violating the human dignity that ADL holds so dear?"

The Denver court's verdict shows that the sometimes seemingly invincible Jewish activist group is not invulnerable. Unlike prominent political and social figures, who are often beholden to special interest groups such as the ADL, independent-spirited citizens, acting as jurors, can sometimes still defy such powerful organizations.

The ADL's defeat in a Denver court was a consequence of its own arrogance in recklessly defaming the Quigleys. Such brazen contempt — not only for decency and common ethics, but even the law — is nothing new for the ADL. Similar arrogance was also manifest in the ADL's extensive spying operation, which was uncovered in 1993, and its decades of censorship and intimidation activities directed against libraries, book publishers, journalists and Internet service providers. (See *The Watchdogs: A Close Look at Anti-Racist 'Watchdog Groups'*, a well documented 102-page booklet by independent researcher Laird Wilcox [and available through the IHR].)

Although the ADL claims to fight discrimination and promote "fair treatment," for decades it has been a staunch defender of Israel and its well-entrenched policies of discrimination against non-Jews, and of the Zionist state's wars of aggression and numerous violations of international law. Similarly, in the United States the ADL upholds a double standard in ardently promoting Jewish ethnic-religious particularism while protesting comparable ethnic-racial particularism by non-Jews.

(Sources: "Charges of bigotry backfire," *The Denver Post*, April 29, 2000; M. Janofsky, "Privacy Rights Win Over Bias Charges in Defamation Case," *The New York Times*, May 13, 2000; "ADL won't be deterred by court defeat," JTA, *Washington Jewish Week*, May 18, 2000, p. 14; "Defaming Defamers"," Editorial, *Washington Jewish Week*, May 16, 2000, p. 16; H. Berkowitz & A. Foxman, "ADL in Denver: setting the record straight," *Washington Jewish Week*, May 25, 2000, p. 18.)

"An old error is always more popular than a new truth."

— German proverb

Thanks

We've stirred up things a lot since the first issue of the *Journal of Historical Review* came out in the spring of 1980 — 20 years ago. Without the staunch support of you, our subscribers, it couldn't have survived. So please keep sending those clippings, the helpful and critical comments on our work, the informative articles, and the extra boost over and above the subscription price. It's our life blood. To everyone who has helped keep the *Journal* alive, our sincerest thanks.

Barnes at His Best!

Barnes Against the Blackout:

Essays Against Interventionism

With an introduction by
James J. Martin



For decades Harry Elmer Barnes – historian, sociologist, criminologist, and journalist – was the greatest of the great revisionist voices against US military interventionism. In this timely collection of nine of his most cogent essays and reviews (indexed here for the first time), he takes aim at a corrupt American historical establishment, which, today, more than ever, rules the roost.

Barnes shows how Americans were lied into World War II, and how "court historians" erected a facade of lies to hide the hollowness of the Allies' "victories" in the two world wars, and then used the false arguments that got us into those wars to erect today's imperialist "New World Order" state.

As topical as today's headlines, this informed and passionate collection is must reading for everyone who cares about America's past, present and future.

Barnes Against the Blackout:
Essays Against Interventionism
Harry Elmer Barnes
Softcover. 360 pages. Index. (#0957)
$8.95, plus $2.50 shipping

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

Treblinka Ground Radar Examination Finds No Trace of Mass Graves

A detailed forensic examination of the site of the wartime Treblinka camp, using sophisticated electronic ground radar, has found no evidence of mass graves there.

For six days in October 1999, an Australian team headed by Richard Krege, a qualified electronics engineer, carried out an examination of the soil at the site of the former Treblinka II camp in Poland, where, Holocaust historians say, more than half a million Jews were put to death in gas chambers and then buried in mass graves.

According to the *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* (1997), for example, "a total of 870,000 people" were killed and buried at Treblinka between July 1942 and April 1943. Then, between April and July 1943, the hundreds of thousands of corpses were allegedly dug up and burned in batches of 2,000 or 2,500 on large grids made of railway ties.

Krege's team used an $80,000 Ground Penetration Radar (GPR) device, which sends out vertical radar signals that are visible on a computer monitor. GPR detects any large-scale disturbances in the soil structure to a normal effective depth of four or five meters, and sometimes up to ten meters. (GPR devices are routinely used around the world by geologists, archeologists, and police.) In its Treblinka investigation, Krege's team also carried out visual soil inspections, and used an auger to take numerous soil core samples.

The team carefully examined the entire Treblinka II site, especially the alleged "mass graves" portion, and carried out control examinations of the surrounding area. They found no soil disturbance consistent with the burial of hundreds of thousands of bodies, or even evidence that the ground had ever been disturbed. In addition, Krege and his team found no evidence of individual graves, bone remains, human ashes, or wood ashes.

"From these scans we could clearly identify the largely undisturbed horizontal stratigraphic layering, better known as horizons, of the soil under the camp site," says the 30-year old Krege, who lives in Canberra. "We know from scans of grave sites, and other sites with known soil disturbances, such as quarries, when this natural layering is massively disrupted or missing altogether." Because normal geological processes are very slow acting, disruption of the soil structure would have been detectable even after 60 years, Krege noted.

While his initial investigation suggests that there were never any mass graves at the Treblinka camp site, Krege believes that further work is still called for.

"Historians say that the bodies were exhumed and cremated towards the end of the Treblinka camp's use in 1943, but we found no indication that any mass graves ever existed," he says. "Personally, I don't think there was an extermination camp there at all."

Krege is preparing a detailed report on his Treblinka investigation. He says that he would welcome the formation, possibly under United Nations auspices, of an international team of neutral, qualified specialists, to carry out similar investigations at the sites of all the wartime German camps.

Krege and his team are associated with, and funded by, the Adelaide Institute, a south Australia revisionist "think tank." Its director, Dr. Fredrick Toben, was jailed in Germany for seven months in 1999 for disputing Holocaust extermination claims.

(Sources: "'Vernichtungslager' Treblinka: archaelogisch betrachtet," by Ing. Richard Krege, in *Vierteljarhreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, June 2000 [4. Jg., Heft 1], pp. 62-64; "'No Jewish mass grave' in Poland," *The Canberra Times*, Jan. 24, 2000, p. 6; "Poland's Jews 'not buried at Treblinka'," *The Examiner* [Australia], Jan. 24, 2000. [The latter two newspaper items are reprinted in facsimile in *VHO-info*, May 2000, p. 30.]; Information provided by Richard Krege; M. Weber and A. Allen, "Treblinka," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1992, pp. 133-158; "German Court Sentences Australian Holocaust Skeptic," *The Journal of Historical Review*, July-August 1999, pp. 2-5; Y. Arad, "Treblinka," in I. Gutman, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* [New York: 1997], pp. 1481-1488.)

PEARL HARBOR
The Story of the Secret War
by George Morgenstern

Hailed by revisionist giants Barnes, Beard and Tansill when it appeared shortly after the Second World War, this classic remains unsurpassed as a one-volume treatment of America's Day of Infamy. Morgenstern's *Pearl Harbor* is the indispensable introduction to the question of who bears the blame for the Pearl Harbor surprise, and, more important, for America's entry through the "back door" into the War. Attractive IHR softcover edition with introduction by James J. Martin. 425 pp., maps, biblio., index, $8.95 + $2.50 shipping.



IHR • PO Box 2739
Newport Beach CA 92659

Revisionist Master's Thesis Under Fire

New Zealand University Resists Jewish Demands

A New Zealand university is rejecting demands by Jewish groups to revoke a master's degree it awarded six years ago for a thesis that disputes Holocaust extermination claims. Citing academic traditions of open scholarship, the University of Canterbury (in Christchurch) has told Jewish community leaders that it will not rescind the degree earned by Joel Stuart Hayward, who endorsed revisionist arguments about Germany's wartime policy toward Europe's Jews in his master's thesis.

Hayward, who now teaches at Massey University in northern New Zealand, recently expressed regret over the thesis.

At the center of the dispute is Hayward's carefully researched 360-page overview of the development and impact of Holocaust revisionism from 1948 to 1993. Written in 1991 and 1992, *The Fate of the Jews in German Hands: An Historical Enquiry Into the Development and Significance of Holocaust Revisionism*, was approved in 1993 with first class honors by the University of Canterbury.

In it Hayward presents evidence to show that there was no German policy to exterminate Europe's Jews, that fewer than six million European Jews died during the Second World War, and that numerous claims of killings in gas chambers are untrue. He points out the unreliability of "eyewitness" evidence of "Holocaust survivors," and notes that numerous Holocaust claims "have been quietly dropped by historians over the years, although few non-specialists have been informed of this and, consequently, the claims are continually repeated."

On the emotion-laden question of wartime killings of Jews in gas chambers, Hayward wrote: "A careful and impartial investigation of the available evidence pertaining to Nazi gas chambers reveals that even these apparently fall into the category of atrocity propaganda." Among the evidence he marshals in support of this view, Hayward cites the 1988 forensic examination by American gas chamber expert Fred Leuchter of the alleged "gas chambers" at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek ("The Leuchter Report"). "Leuchter's unorthodox conclusions, which at first seem incredible, do appear to be supported by ample evidence," wrote Hayward.

In summing up "the revisionists," Hayward writes: "It is worth repeating one point made above:

Joel Hayward

some revisionist books and articles (such as those by Weber, Irving and Faurisson) are balanced and authoritative, containing both solid research and highly-developed analysis. They contribute substantially to the accumulated body of knowledge about the Holocaust, and should not be ignored or discounted out-of-hand by historians upholding received opinion. The truth-seeking historian has nothing to fear from these scholars." In a 60-page chapter on the Institute for Historical Review, Hayward praises Mark Weber (now IHR Director) as a "thoughtful and serious historian" who has produced "consistently well-researched and cogently-argued writings on the Holocaust and other historical topics."

In his thesis' conclusion, Hayward sums up:

> ... The gassing claim is irreconcilable with the overwhelming weight of evidence on the nature of official Nazi policy on the Jewish question. That policy, our careful and unbiased reading of the evidence suggested, was not one of total extermination, but was a brutal policy of deportation and forced labor.
>
> ... The weight of evidence supports the view that the Nazis did not systematically exterminate Jews in gas chambers or have an extermination policy as such, [even though] it cannot be denied that Jews in German hands suffered terribly during the Second World War ... The total would undoubtedly be more than one million and far less than the symbolic figure of six million.

In an analysis of the thesis published in the *New Zealand Jewish Chronicle* (April 2000), a Jewish academic, Prof. Dov Bing, speculated that "in 1991 it seems that Joel Hayward had been caught in the web of Holocaust deniers. Although he set out to critically analyze their views in an objective academic manner, he ended up supporting them. He came to admire people like Irving, Faurisson and Weber."

Jewish groups are understandably upset with

Hayward's thesis, especially because it was approved — after seemingly careful supervision and review — with first class honors, and then remained unchallenged for five years. The New Zealand Jewish Council, the main body representing organized Jewry in that country, has asked Canterbury University to revoke Hayward's master's degree.

As soon as the thesis was accepted, Hayward imposed an embargo on it, allowing only those with his permission to see it. Until last year is contents remained unknown, except to a small number of revisionist scholars around the world. Then it was posted, without his authorization, on the Internet, and Fredrick Toben, director of the revisionist Adelaide Institute, sought to use it (also without Hayward's authorization) in a legal dispute in Australia.

At this point, Hayward issued an addendum to his now-public thesis, repudiating its main conclusions. In his "recantation" he wrote:

> My thesis represents an honest attempt on my part to make sense of events I wanted to understand better. Yet I now regret working on such a complex topic without sufficient knowledge and preparation, and I hope this brief addendum will prevent my work causing distress to the Jewish community here in New Zealand and elsewhere, or being misused by individuals or groups with malevolent motives ... With the benefit of hindsight and eight years of subsequent research, I can now see that it [the thesis] contains several errors of fact and interpretation ...

In a recent letter to the *New Zealand Jewish Chronicle*, Hayward wrote: "I believe that, without doubt, around six million Jews perished during World War II. They were murdered by Nazis and their allies. The perpetrators used a range of methods, including gas chambers, shooting, physical exhaustion and starvation, to carry out this monstrous crime."

How sincere is Hayward's "recantation"? One indication that his most recently expressed views on the Holocaust may be less than entirely sincere is that they were issued only after his thesis had (without his authorization) been made public, and was beginning to come under attack. As recently as November 1998, Hayward was sharply critical of anti-revisionists. For example, he called Deborah Lipstadt's book, *Denying the Holocaust*, "hopeless. Very poor indeed."

Hayward was born in 1964 in Christchurch, New Zealand. While in his twenties, he adopted Joel as his first name to affirm his partial Jewish ancestry. Today he is a well regarded member of the academic faculty at Massey University in Palmerston North, New Zealand, where he is "senior lecturer" and program coordinator of defense and strategic studies in the university's School of History, Philosophy and Politics.

Hayward writes and teaches on military history, strategy and operational art. In addition to numerous articles published in scholarly journals, he is the author of a critically well-received 395-page historical study, *Stopped at Stalingrad: The Luftwaffe and Hitler's Defeat in the East, 1943-1943*, which was published in 1998 by the University of Kansas Press.

The Kupka Affair

In a related affair in New Zealand, Jewish groups recently demanded that Waikato University expel from its doctoral study program a German student who, they charge, is an anti-Jewish "Holocaust denier." Hans-Joachim Kupka, 55 years old, had been working on a Ph.D. dissertation that would analyze the contribution to New Zealand society of immigrants from Germany and Austria.

Jewish groups expressed alarm that before moving to New Zealand in 1992 Kupka had been active in Germany in the allegedly "neo-Nazi" Republikaner party. During the 1980s he was the party's regional chairman in lower Bavaria, and in 1987 became deputy chairman of the party's Bavarian section. Jewish academics also cited writings by Kupka in recent years that he had posted on the Internet, calling them "anti-Semitic Holocaust denial." Jewish students organized protest marches at the University demanding his expulsion.

On the other hand, three Waikato University professors who evaluated Kupka's writings concluded that they "could in no way be interpreted as being remotely right-wing." Similarly, the university's vice chancellor found that the writings did not constitute "Holocaust denial."

With Jewish pressure mounting, Kupka suddenly withdrew from his doctoral study program. In spite of this, the local *Waikato Times* reported (July 6, 2000), "the Jewish community will not let the matter rest," and demanded a critical review of the university's handling of the matter.

The Roques Affair

The Hayward and Kupka affairs recall the 1986 case of Henri Roques, a French scholar whose doctoral degree was revoked by government order — for the first time in the nearly eight centuries of French university life — because the revisionist conclusion of his doctoral dissertation enraged Jewish groups. In his dissertation, Roques closely examined the "confessions" of SS officer Kurt Gerstein, which for decades have been a main piece of evidence for gas chamber killings. Roques concluded that Gerstein's

postwar testimony is "extravagant and crammed with improbabilities," lacks the evidentiary value one should require of a historical document, and cannot be accepted as a proof for the existence of wartime homicidal gas chambers.

Roques doctorate was revoked even though his dissertation had been accepted by a panel of three professors at the University of Nantes. And even after the "Roques scandal" became public, the prominent British historian Hugh Trevor-Roper (Lord Dacre) praised Roques' dissertation (in a 1990 letter) as "an entirely legitimate, scholarly and responsible work of *Quellenkritik* [source critique] on a limited but important subject." (See the Sept.-Oct. 1993 *Journal*, pp. 40-41.)

Roques, a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee, addressed the Eighth (1987) IHR Conference. (See H. Roques, "From the Gerstein Affair to the Roques Affair," in the Spring 1988 *Journal*, pp. 5-23.) His dissertation was published in English by the IHR under the title *The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein*, and is still available for sale from the IHR.

The IHR Needs Your Help

Only with the sustained help of friends can the Institute for Historical Review carry on its vital mission of promoting truth in history. If you agree that the work of our Institute is important, please support it with your generous donation!

Georgi K. Zhukov

From Moscow to Berlin

Marshal Zhukov's Greatest Battles

The greatest Soviet commander talls how he directed the Red Army's bitter last-ditch defense of Moscow, master-minded the encirclement and defeat of the German Sixth Army at Stalingrad, smashed the last great German counteroffensive of Kursk-Orel, and led the climactic assault on Hitler's Berlin. Must reading for every student of military history. Hardcover, 304 pp., photos, maps, $12.95, plus $2.50 for shipping.

Available from

IHR • POB 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

A revisionist classic!

The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein

Here is the headline-making university doctoral dissertation that debunks the key "Holocaust" testimony of SS officer Kurt Gerstein — the enigmatic, twisted Third Reich functionary who claimed to have witnessed mass gassings of Jews in 1942. In this closely argued study a French scholar subjects Gerstein's accusations to critical examination, striking at the very roots of the Holocaust extermination story. The stunning conclusion: not only are Gerstein's allegations of mass killings of Jews groundless, but prominent Holocaust historians have deliberately manipulated and falsified key parts of Gerstein's tortured testimony.

Henri Roques

This powerful exposé and its author made world headlines in 1986 when, for the first time in the nearly eight-century history of French universities, a duly awarded doctorate was revoked by government order.

Gerstein's bogus "confessions" were the basis of the anti-German and anti-Catholic hysteria stirred by Rolf Hochhuth's play "The Deputy." Roques' study thus shatters the myth of Pope Pius XII's complicity in Holocaust genocide.

British historian Hugh Trevor-Roper (Lord Dacre) praised this study as "an entirely legitimate, scholarly and responsible work of *Quellenkritik* [source critique] on a limited but important subject."

Michel de Bouard of the Institut de France declared: "Had I been a member of the jury, I would probably have given a grade of 'very good' to Mr. Roques' thesis."

Includes transcripts and translations of all six versions of Gerstein's "testimonies," as well as facsimiles of the original texts and other previously unpublished documents and records. Translated from the French by Ronald Percival, who also provides a foreword.

The 'Confessions' of Kurt Gerstein

by Henri Roques

Quality softcover. 325 pp. Charts. Index. (#0687)

$7.50, plus $2.50 shipping

Institute for Historical Review

P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

German Professor, Accused of Revisionism, Commits Suicide

Werner Pfeifenberger, a German professor of political science, took his life in Austria on May 13, 2000, a few weeks before he was to go on trial in Vienna for an allegedly revisionist and "neo-Nazi" essay published five years ago. The 58-year-old scholar was scheduled to appear on June 26 before a district criminal court, where he faced up to ten years imprisonment for a 1995 writing that allegedly violated Austria's anti-Nazism law. His attorney said that Pfeifenberger, fearing an unfair trial, had announced his intention to take his life.

Pfeifenberger, born in October 1941, was once a well-regarded scholar. After studying law, economics and political science, he taught at colleges or universities in Salzburg, Münster, Paderborn, Grenoble (France), Stellenbosch (South Africa), and Taipei (Taiwan). For a time he served as director of the semi-official Austrian Institute for Political Education, and from 1978 to 1983 was responsible for its periodical, "Political Education."

For years Prof. Pfeifenberger had been under fire from leftist and Jewish groups, which cited his support for allegedly "neo-fascist" or "neo-Nazi" organizations such as the "Austria Cultural Foundation" and the "German-South Africa Society." Critics also cited his defense of the apartheid government in South Africa, and his writings for "right wing" periodicals.

His troubles became much more pronounced after his essay, "Internationalism and Nationalism: a Never-Ending Mortal Enmity?," appeared in the 1995 Year Book of the Academy of Austria's Freedom Party. A prominent Jewish journalist, Karl Pfeifer, took aim at Pfeifenberger and his essay. Writing in the magazine of Vienna's Jewish Community, Pfeifer accused him of employing "neo-Nazi tones" ("*Neo-Nazi Töne*"), of extolling the "national community" ("*Volksgemeinschaft*"), and of reviving "the old Nazi legend of a Jewish world conspiracy." The Jewish periodical cited Pfeifenberger's mention of a "Jewish war against Germany," referring to world Jewry's 1933 declaration of an international boycott action (economic war) against Third Reich Germany, and his portrayal of former Austrian president Kurt Waldheim as a victim rather than a perpetrator.

The Jewish journalist's broadside began a campaign against Dr. Pfeifenberger that finally ended with the professor's suicide.

In Germany, a leading member of the Social Democratic faction in parliament expressed concern about the essay's supposedly "anti-Semitic tendencies," and in 1997 the government of the state of North Rhine-Westphalia dismissed Pfeifenberger from his teaching post at a specialized college (*Fachhochschule*) in Muenster. This summary dismissal was overturned in April 1998. and in October 1999 he was given a new position at a specialized college in Bielefeld. However, because this substitute position was only as a researcher, his career as a teacher was effectively finished.

Werner Pfeifenberger (1941-2000): Death Claims a Victim of Legal Persecution

In Austria's parliament, members of the Social Democratic and Green parties denounced Pfeifenberger's essay, and pressed for legal action against the Year Book's publisher, namely the rival Freedom Party of Joerg Haider. And a court in Vienna, affirming a charge made by the Jewish community magazine, found that Pfeifenberger's essay contained "Nazi tones" ("*Nazitöne*").

Typical of such cases in Germany and Austria, the accuracy or truthfulness of Pfeifenberger's writing was not an issue. An offensive "tone" or "diction"

is enough to bring legal action against an author.

This was also manifest in a case involving David Irving. At a meeting in Munich in April 1990, the British historian told his audience that the "gas chamber" shown for decades to tourists at the Auschwitz I main camp is a fake. Irving was quickly charged, and a German court duly fined him 10,000 marks. In January 1993 a Munich court trebled the fine to 30,000 marks (about $21,000). It simply didn't matter that Irving's provocative statement was, in fact, completely true. Remarkably, even Robert Jan Van Pelt, a major defense witness in the recent Irving-Lipstadt trial in London, has himself acknowledged that the infamous Auschwitz I "gas chamber" is actually a fraudulent postwar reconstruction. (See: R. Faurisson, "The 'Gas Chamber' of Auschwitz I," Sept.-Dec. 1999 *Journal*, pp. 12-13.)

The Pfeifenberger case is not only another blow against freedom of expression and research in Germany and Austria, it manifests the hypocritical "democracy" that prevails in much of Europe today.

Even before he decided to commit suicide, noted the Vienna weekly paper *Zur Zeit* (June 2-8, 2000), Werner Pfeifenberger's professional life had already been destroyed. Rather than endure further disgrace and ruin, he chose death. The "politically correct" enemies of freedom of expression and scholarly research can proudly claim another victim. Whatever justification there may have been for Austria's law banning any revival of National Socialism (Nazism), the paper went on to comment, the broadening of that law in 1992 has provided the enemies of intellectual freedom with a "fascism club" to intimidate adversaries. "As one can see," *Zur Zeit* continued, the 1992 law has proven to be "a serious mistake, for which Werner Pfeifenberger has paid with his life."

Pfeifenberger's death recalls the suicide five years ago of a retired German chemist. On April 25, 1995, Reinhold Elstner took his life in downtown Munich by setting himself on fire in protest half a century of "defamation" and a "Niagara flood of lies pouring down on our nation." In a statement written before his death, he explained: "Fifty years of ceaseless defamation, ugly lies and demonization of an entire people are enough!... Now 75 years old, there's not much more I can do. Through my death in flames I can nonetheless still give a final visible expression of my views. If, as a result, even one German comes to his senses and finds the way to truth, then my sacrifice will not have been in vain ..." (See "A German Takes His Life to Protest Defamation and Historical Lies," Sept.-Oct. 1995 *Journal*, pp. 23-24.)

— *M. W.*

Polish Professor Fired for Dissident History Book

A Polish history professor has been fired by his university and banned from teaching elsewhere for publishing a book suggesting that wartime Germany did not have an overall plan or policy to exterminate Europe's Jews. The state-run University of Opole announced in early April 2000 that Dariusz Ratajczak, 37, had violated ethical standards and would be banned from teaching at other universities for three years.

Ratajczak, who is popular with students, was suspended in April 1999 from his teaching post with the university's Historical Institute after state prosecutors opened an investigation into the publication of his book *Tematy niebezpieczne* ("Dangerous Themes"). With a child to support, his financial situation is precarious. (See: "Polish Professor Under Fire for 'Holocaust Denial'," May-June 1999 *Journal*, p. 31.)

In December 1999 a court in Opole (Silesia) found Ratajczak guilty of spreading revisionist views on the Holocaust, but the court did not punish him, saying that the book's limited distribution was not damaging enough to warrant punishment under a Polish law that makes it a crime to publicly deny German wartime or Communist-era crimes. The court also noted that Ratajczak had distanced himself from revisionist views in a preface to the second edition of the book. (See "No Punishment for Polish 'Holocaust Denier'," in the Sept.-Dec. 1999 *Journal*, p. 47.)

Ratajczak argued that he had merely summarized opinions of historians who hold dissident views on the Holocaust issue, and that his own views are not in line with all the opinions in his book. "I was only presenting various views on the Holocaust to students," he said.

In a five-page section of his book entitled "Holocaust Revisionism," Ratajczak matter-of-factly cited the work of such revisionists as Paul Rassinier, Robert Faurisson, David Irving and Ernst Zündel, who contend that there was no German plan or program to exterminate Europe's Jews. He also cited the forensic investigations carried out at Auschwitz and Birkenau by Fred Leuchter and Germar Rudolf, and their conclusions that, for technical reasons, well-known claims of killing millions of Jews in gas chambers are impossible.

While Ratajczak did not explicitly endorse these views, he did call Holocaust "eyewitness" testimony "useless," and described establishment Holocaust writers as "followers of a religion of the Holocaust" who impose on others "a false image of the past." He also argued that three million Jews died in "the

Holocaust," not the often-claimed six million.

Ratajczak published 320 copies of the book in March 1999 at his own expense. Only a few were sold at the university bookstore or directly to students, or were given away to friends, before police seized the remaining copies. In September 1999 he financed a second edition of 30,000 copies, which were offered in kiosks and by mail order across Poland. The publisher, a small firm in Warsaw, reportedly censored the most "extreme" statements, placing them in notes at the book's end. A few thousand copies have been sold, Ratajczak reports.

"Holocaust denial" is a crime in several European states, including Germany, France, and Austria.

— *M. W.*

Visit www.ihr.org

IHR Internet Web Site Offers Worldwide Access to Revisionism

On its own Internet web site, **www.ihr.org**, the Institute for Historical Review makes available an impressive selection of IHR material, including dozens of IHR *Journal* articles and reviews. It also includes a listing of every item that has ever appeared in this Journal, as well as the complete texts of *The Zionist Terror Network*, "The Leuchter Report," and Kulaszka's encyclopedic work *Did Six Million Really Die?* New material is added as time permits.

Key words can be located in any of the site's items using a built-in search capability.

Through the IHR web site, revisionist scholarship is instantly available to millions of computer users worldwide, free of censorship by governments or powerful special interest groups. It can be reached 24 hours a day from around the globe through the World Wide Web (WWW), a multimedia Internet service.

Journal associate editor Greg Raven maintains and operates this site as its "webmaster." Because it is linked to several other revisionist (and anti-revisionist) web sites, visitors can easily access vast amounts of additional information.

The IHR web site address is
http://www.ihr.org
E-mail messages can be sent to
ihr@ihr.org



Between March 1998 and June 2000, the average number of daily IHR web site "hits" has tended to grow steadily. During each "visit," one can make several "hits."

The Irving Trial, 'Human Rights' Double Standard, and Jewish-Zionist Arrogance

DOUG COLLINS

The Irving Trial

Doug Collins

Having been out of the country when the Irving-Lipstadt libel trial verdict came down [April 11] and for some time thereafter I was not able to write anything about it. I was in Jerusalem, where our tour guide did not fail to mention the Holocaust and the six million Jews. Politeness being one of my weaknesses I did not argue with him.

Some people are now asking what I thought of the decision, in which, of course, Mr. Irving was denounced as an anti-Semite, a racist, and a Holocaust denier. My answer, in short, was what I had said while the trial was still on: that he stood not a cat's chance in hell of winning. No judge, British or otherwise, was about to take on the world-wide Jewish Establishment. He would himself have been branded an anti-Semite, a racist, and a Holocaust denier.

The victors are now dancing the Hora, and may be forgiven for thinking that the argument about the Holocaust and its politics is now over. But they would be wrong. In the first place, the trial judge did not validate the six million story even though he claimed, with Deborah Lipstadt, that Irving had distorted history. At the same time he, the judge, confessed he was no historian, which hardly strengthens his decision.

All historians believe their own theses, and as Professor Donald Cameron Watt pointed out in London's *Evening Standard* [April 11], "Show me any historian who has not broken into a cold sweat at the thought of undergoing similar treatment," meaning that Irving had to endure two months of being attacked by hostile historians and top-ranking (and ranting) Jewish lawyers.

One against 20, and the judge paid the star of this show the compliment of stating that "Mr. Irving knows his stuff." In the *New York Press* [April 18], George Szamuely wrote that "though he lost the case, he held his own against scholars of international repute."

In short, although Irving lost, and will be ruined if his appeal is unsuccessful (which, again, I expect it to be) he has also won. Never before has there been such an ocean of critical publicity on this subject. It has dominated the pages of the world's media and has already led to opinions being expressed that would not have been, pre-trial.

As David Cesarani, who I believe is Jewish, reported in *The Guardian* [Jan. 18], "David Irving

---

Doug Collins is the recipient of two of Canada's most coveted awards for journalism. His career included work as a reporter and commentator for several major Canadian daily papers, and on television and radio. Collins served with the British army during the Second World War, and then with the British Control Commission in occupied Germany. He is the author of several books, including *POW: A Soldier's Story of His Ten Escapes from Nazi Prison Camps* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1968). From 1983 until his retirement in September 1997, he wrote a popular column for the *North Shore News* of North Vancouver, British Columbia. In January 1993 he was awarded the Commemorative Medal for the 125th Anniversary of Canada's Confederation, which is given to persons "who have made a significant contribution to their fellow citizens, their community or to Canada." His presentation at the 1990 IHR Conference, "Reflections on the Second World War, Free Speech and Revisionism," was published in the Fall 1991 *Journal*.

The three columns published here are dated, in order, April 27, May 10, and May 22, 2000.

may be isolated in his high court battle, but a growing number of respectable academics are criticizing what they have dubbed the 'Holocaust Industry' ... Serious scholars on both sides of the Atlantic who scorn [Irving's] methods and arguments are questioning the purposes to which the Holocaust is being put. They are asking if it deserves a special protected place in the public consciousness."

Some, he went on, are asking whether memorialization of the Holocaust, as well as Holocaust studies in schools and universities, are not being used wrongly, or simply getting out of hand. (Hello there, you government lickspittles in Victoria, who have just stepped into line with British Columbia's very own Memorial Day!)

Even before the Lipstadt trial began, an announcement that there were plans for a "Shoah Centre" in Manchester caused Brian Sewell of the *Evening Standard* to write: "Can we not say to the Jews of Manchester that enough has been made of their Holocaust and that they are too greedy for our memories?"

The case for Irving's being a "Holocaust denier" seems to rest on his claim that there were no gas chambers at Auschwitz and on his rejection of the six million story. Here the judge said in his ruling that Irving was right to point out that contemporaneous documents "give ... little clear evidence of the existence of gas chambers designed to kill human beings." To support his judgment, he relied on witnesses for the defense. Which raises the question what, precisely, is a "denier"? Irving, after all, had said that between one million and four million Jews died.

Denial depends on who and what is being denied. Historian Robert W. Thurston is one of several who have claimed that Stalin was not guilty of mass murder from 1934 to 1941. For them, too, the Gulag didn't exist, except for criminals who would have been in jail in any country — the kind of bilge that Eleanor Roosevelt swallowed.

No disgrace for them, though. They are hardly noticed. Even if they were, and faced a case against their critics, there would be no millions of dollars forthcoming for their defense from the Spielbergs, the Bronfmans or the American Jewish Committee, as they were for Lipstadt.

To repeat: this trial marks the start of a new look at the politics of the Holocaust. And it will continue. Have I ever lied to you?

To get the international media comment on this case, I recommend Irving's web page. It's all there, pro and con, at **http://www.fpp.co.uk/online.html**



David Irving enters the London court building for another day of arguments in the Irving-Lipstadt libel trial.

Milquetoasts, Malcontents and the Zeitgeist

What is it about this country that prevents people from facing reality. Why is it, for instance, that the authorities ignore the excesses of the Left, while any similar actions of the Right would result in outrage?

For the most part we can blame what the Germans call *der Zeitgeist*, or the Spirit of the Times. On the West Coast, for instance, a riot against the Canadian Free Speech League in the Vancouver Public Library excited only yawns. But if rightists had rioted against the Left or against B'nai B'rith, the event would have scorched the front pages of the nation's press. TV pundits and editorialists would have viewed with brow-wrinkling alarm, and cartoonists would have had a field day drawing swastikas.

The riot in question took place last September 29th, as I attempted to raise funds for my court challenge to the British Columbia Human Rights Act, under which I have twice been hauled before kangaroo court tribunals. About 150 invading leftists — scum to a man, and woman — howled for the blood of gladiators Doug Christie and myself, while two dozen policemen and six library security guards could not control them as they wrecked the affair. Bedlam had nothing on it. Yet no charges were laid. Which, these days, is par for the course, the Zeitgeist being what it is. But the real story is what the library did or did not do about it.

Multiculters, Jews (if it isn't anti-Semitic to say so!), Communists and Socialists screamed that "hate groups" like the Free Speech League should not be allowed to darken the library doors, and never mind that the title of my talk was "The NDP's Attack on Free Speech" — a reference to that party's appalling Human Rights Code that permits Pre-

mier Ujjal Dosanjh and Co. to go after anyone who tells a Newfie joke.

In response, the library board held a public forum in April to test opinion as to whether people like the League should be able to rent library premises. Needless to say, Mary Woo-Sims was there, she being the leather-jacketed Lesbian who heads the Human Rights Commission. So was Alan Dutton, the leftist who gets $100,000 a year in government grants to plead the multicult cause and who told the CBC that he would continue to oppose with force any "so-called free speech meetings."

To its credit, the library board did not entirely collapse in the face of this attack. But it stated that renters would have to agree not to contravene the Criminal Code or the Human Rights Act of British Columbia while holding meetings.

This was more than passing strange, since one might conclude from that that the League had done so.

So I wrote back to point out that if anyone had contravened the code it was the rioters. Why didn't the Library Board say so? And why was the riot not condemned? As for not contravening the Rights Act, could any speaker guarantee not to tell a Newfie joke?

Mr. Christie also took pen in hand. He wanted to know why the library had not announced that the law regarding peaceful assembly would be enforced. "Is it your policy," he asked, "that if someone screamed and shouted at a person reading a book you would not have them evicted from the property? I doubt it. More than likely you would call the police and the person would be arrested for causing a disturbance. Why would the same principle not apply to protection of the right of peaceful assembly...?"

He went on to deal with the silly ruling regarding the Human Rights Act, pointing out that it is under challenge in the courts, and that people should instead be asked to "maintain and uphold the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, specifically freedom of speech, thought, belief, opinion and freedom of assembly. These are equally important values, which apparently you are not prepared to maintain with the same strict requirements."

"All in all," concluded Mr. Christie, "the policy you have adopted, in the long run, seems inclined to gradually squeeze from public discussion and discourse those who are vilified by the extreme left-wing in Canada."

It is doubtful that the Library Board will provide any substantive answers to our questions because our points are unanswerable. Instinctively, the Board recognizes where the power lies, especially in British Columbia, which is why I will not try to speak in the library again.

Does that mean that the scum have won? No. They haven't managed to control the Internet, and it is to be hoped that they don't yet control the courts. Also, an election is due next year in which the NDP will disappear down the drain of iniquity.

But for the time being the Zeitgeist prevails. He blows with the wind, however, and the wind can change. Meanwhile, it is up to all freedom lovers to make sure it does.

Tits and Tats

"Arrogance: Aggressively assertive or presumptuous; overbearing." — Oxford English Dictionary

There is no lack of arrogance in our world. In the scales of argument, arrogance certainly outweighs humility, and I hereby award the Nobel Prize for Arrogance to groups like the Canadian Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center. All are arrogantly opposed to free speech, which in their book is hate speech if they don't like what is being said.

Stating such qualifies one to be condemned to the Devil's Island of Anti-Semitism, of course. For, as is obvious to everyone except the intellectually blind or cowardly, any criticism of things Jewish becomes "anti-Semitic." And not only to Jews, but to lickspittles in government and "liberals."

Subversive thoughts of that sort are not new and have led to my being chased by human wrongs commissions. As *B.C. Report* magazine put it a while back, the human rights industry has declared war on civil liberties and free speech.

I know of no groups who wage that war more fanatically than B'nai B'rith, etc., but I wouldn't say so once again were it not for some comments on the subject by Joseph Sobran, an American syndicated columnist and one of the sharpest intellects in the media.

"The Jewish lobby ..." he writes in his newsletter [reprinted in the Jan.-Feb. 2000 *Journal*, pp. 67-69], "now inspires enormous fear because of its power to ruin politicians, writers, and businesses. It wields such dreaded labels as anti-Semite and bigot with abandon and — here is the real point — with impunity.

"Far from being persecuted, or remotely threatened with persecution, Jews in the modern democracies are very powerful. That is why they are feared, and why their labels terrify. If they were really helpless victims, there would be no reason to fear them ..."

"Most Jews," he adds, "take no active part in the thought-control campaign and many would oppose it if they considered it seriously; but the major secular Jewish organizations are determined to silence any public discourse that is not to their liking, as witness the fate of people as disparate as [David]

Irving, Louis Farrakhan, and Pat Buchanan" (not to mention my far humbler self).

Sobran was dealing with the situation in the United States. But it is no different in Canada and is even worse in Europe, where the slightest murmur questioning the official version of the Holocaust can land people in jail.

The Holocaust, indeed, has become a massive shield used not only in the democracies but also in the Middle East, as the Palestinians have learned to their cost. The standard account of the Holocaust, states Sobran, serves political interests. Israel "has enjoyed great indulgence from the United States by justifying its violence against its Arab neighbors and its abuses of its Arab minority as necessary defensive measures by a people still traumatized by persecution and threatened by annihilation."

The Zionist lobby, he says, has become one of the most powerful forces in American politics, and any criticism of Jews or of Israel becomes "anti-Semitism." Holocaust denial, meanwhile (or what passes for Holocaust denial) "has become a capital thought-crime."

Its real function, he continues, "is not to identify and disarm real hostility to Jews, but to terrorize".

An example of that was evident after the riot in the Vancouver Public Library last September, when I spoke about the threat to free speech as represented by the B.C. Human Rights Code.

The Canadian Jewish Congress and B'nai B'rith arrogantly lobbied the library to prevent "known hate groups" from using its premises, and in a recent issue of the *Western Jewish Bulletin*, Jewish biggies deplored the fact that it had failed to do so. Some of the most controversial rentals, they claimed, had been to "outspoken anti-Semites". (Names, please.)

Up popped the Holocaust again, too. B'nai B'rith's Harry Abram, a devoted enemy of free speech said that survivors of the Holocaust would feel intimidated if there were speakers in the library who were denying that it ever took place. A fine broth, that. The man makes no sense, as usual.

For my part, I have never said it didn't take place. But even if someone told me that the Second World War itself had never taken place — and I was in it for six years — I would laugh at them. Laughs are in short supply, however, where Abrams is concerned. Or perhaps not. He once suggested that I was preparing the ground for another Holocaust.

Meanwhile, aren't the above named Jewish organizations hate groups? They certainly hate little old harmless me (as witness the "rights" complaints against me) and are selectively opposed to free assembly, which, the last time I looked, is supposedly guaranteed to all who nest in the True North.

If they ever use it, perhaps we should lobby to keep *them* out of the library. Doesn't every tit deserve a tat?

Even Japan has learned what happens to those who commit sacrilege against the secular religion of the Holocaust. "Holocaust Pressure Groups Shut Down Japan's *Marco Polo* Magazine," a 30-page IHR Special Report, includes a translation of Dr. Nishioka's headline-making *Marco Polo* article, facsimile copies of numerous reports from American and Japanese English-language newspapers on the *Marco Polo* furor, a feature article from the March-April 1995 *Journal,* and more.

Holocaust Pressure Groups Shut Down Marco Polo
$7.00 postpaid (CA sales tax $.39)

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

"I defended freedom in the 1940s when Hitler was on the loose, in the 1970s when the federal hate laws were passed, and in the 1990s when those idiots in Victoria passed their misnamed Human Rights Act, and that I shall go on defending freedom until the day I die."

— Doug Collins

"The Irving libel case is the nearest thing liberal London society can get to a trial for witchcraft or blasphemy."

— Doug Collins

"As societies grow decadent, the language grows decadent, too. Words are used to disguise, not to illuminate, action: you liberate a city by destroying it. Words are to confuse, so that at election time people will solemnly vote against their own interests."

— Gore Vidal, *The Day the American Empire Ran Out of Gas* (1987)

On Prejudice, the 'Jewish Question,' and Communism's Legacy

JOSEPH SOBRAN

Created Equal

The United States was founded in the republican conviction that heredity shouldn't be destiny. This doctrine has many ramifications, not all of them strictly logical or mutually consistent. The Declaration of Independence declares that all men are created equal; the Constitution forbids titles of nobility; it eventually outlawed chattel slavery; "civil rights" has come to mean that even private employers must not hire according to ethnic criteria; racial prejudice, "racism," has become a social taboo; and even generalizations about ethnic groups are frowned on (unless they flatter the "contributions" of this or that group). The only trait it's now safe to ascribe to whole races is victimhood.

And yet common sense tells us that groups and nations do have distinct characters, with characteristic vices as well as virtues. When we aren't on our guard against the thought police, we may discuss such things freely. American individualism is balanced by the earthy sociology of stereotypes, which, as the great sociologist John Murray Cuddihy assures us, "are more or less accurate." Obviously what is true of the group may not apply to this or that member, but the group still has its own habits and ways, maybe even its own culture (or "subculture," to use a word my generation learned in college). The individual may show the group's traits for the same reason he speaks in the accents of his native place: from early childhood he imitates those around him, often without even realizing it.

How does a group get a reputation that lasts over centuries? Is any such reputation a "prejudice"? A "prejudice" need not be a prejudgment; it may be the settled conclusion of long experience. In Europe Jews and gypsies were unpopular for centuries. Many Jews blame this fact, which they call "*anti-Semitism*," on Christianity, which they consider superstition, thereby denying any empirical foundation to the gentiles' distrust. The word *anti-Semitism* itself implies that all frictions between Jews and gentiles must be blamed on the gentiles. Hence the campaign to tar Pope Pius XII and the Catholic Church as "anti-Semitic."

Joseph Sobran

But the slang words *jew* and *gyp* tell another story: the bad reputations of both groups have less to do with religion than with practical experience and word-of-mouth tradition. Notice that the unpopularity of such groups has more to do with distrust than with simple hatred. The verbs *jew* and *gyp* imply sharp dealing and low ethics. The Middle East bears witness that the Jews may be unpopular even where most of the population is non-Christian. They haven't endeared themselves to Muslim Arabs; just as they were unpopular in the ancient pagan world. As a matter of fact, most of the world's Jews have chosen to live in Christian countries. Would they have done so if Christians were always hostile to Jews?

Majority populations sometimes explode in violence against these minorities, but that has always been the exception. And of course our ethnic etiquette forbids us to ask the obvious question: Have the minorities ever done anything to exasperate the majority?

A government can launch a hate campaign and excite the population to violence; this sort of top-down hatred has been a frequent feature of modern states. But most prejudices aren't created by official doctrines; they result from popular experience and the slow spreading of a group's reputation. The first gypsy I ever met — on a street in Rome — grabbed a wad of money out of my hand. I'd been too naive to

---

Joseph Sobran is an author, lecturer and nationally syndicated columnist. For 21 years he wrote for *National Review* magazine, including 18 years as a senior editor. He is editor of the monthly newsletter *Sobran's* (P.O. Box 1383, Vienna, VA 22183. To order call 1-800-493-3348 or e-mail fran@griffnews.com.) He also writes the regular "Washington Watch" column for *The Wanderer*, a traditionalist Roman Catholic weekly (201 Ohio St., St. Paul, MN 55107).

"Created Equal" is from the January 2000 issue of *Sobran's* newsletter. The single-paragraph item about the Irving trial is from *Sobran's*, June 2000, p. 2. "The Forgiven Holocaust" is from *Sobran's*, July 1997. "The Black Book" is from *The Wanderer*, January 1, 1998. "Duranty's Denials" is from *Sobran's*, August 1997.

be wary of her, though my companions had warned me against her.

Hilaire Belloc's book *The Jews*, published in 1922, should be required reading for anyone who wants to understand what used to be frankly called (even by Jews) "the Jewish problem." Belloc addressed the problem from the Christian point of view, but he did it in an even-handed way, acknowledging that the vices of the Jews are often the obverse of their virtues. He wrote at a time when "Jewish Bolshevism," based in Russia, menaced Christendom. The Jewish Communists in every country seemed to embody, in extreme form, every bad trait ascribed to the Jews: hatred of the majority and its religion, duplicity, materialism, lust for power.

The Jews' long survival is often called "miraculous." It would seem so — literally. Judaism is based on divine revelation, and the highly tribal and patriarchal Mosaic law, so contrary to every precept of modern liberalism, has created a race of people who have refused assimilation to their surrounding populations over many centuries.

Moreover, the Jews have preserved as their holy books (which Christians call the "Old Testament") writings which portray them in a very unfavorable light. They repeatedly stray from the Law and God has to keep rebuking the "stiff-necked people" and punishing them with terrible severity, even allowing their enemies to conquer them. In all this the Jews are in striking contrast to the ancient Romans, for example, who glorified themselves and developed a self-congratulatory mythology (as in Virgil's *Aeneid*). Today the mighty Roman Empire is long gone; the Jews are still here, thanks in large part to their capacity for spiritual self-criticism. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth." The Jews, to their glory, took his chastenings to heart.

Jews who adhere to their religion also believe that moral laws are as objective as physical laws. Their moral sense is stern, vigorous, and realistic, without the sentimental Christian tendency to turn morality into mush, with every sinner getting an infinite number of second chances. In that respect, early Christianity was much closer to Judaism than to modern watered-down Christianity.

Of course most Jews no longer believe in Judaism; many are hostile to any religion, including their own. In substituting Zionism for Judaism they have adopted a self-exalting modern nationalism, rejecting all criticism as "anti-Semitism." The state of Israel practices every form of discrimination against non-Jews that secularized Jews reject when they are a minority anywhere else in the world. But this obvious fact is mentioned publicly at one's own risk. The idea of the Chosen People is separated both from the Mosaic Law and from any sense of a transcendent mission to the goyim — "the nations." And Zionist jingoism, forever casting Jews as innocent victims, has taken its toll on the ancient Jewish capacity for rigorous self-criticism. Just as gentile criticism of Jews has become "anti-Semitism," Jewish self-criticism has become "self-hatred."

Modern Jewry violently resented the 1975 United Nations declaration (later rescinded) that Zionism is "a form of racism and racial discrimination," but that is what Jews would rightly call any state based on similar laws consigning Jews to inferior status. Israeli laws on intermarriage and residence (92 per cent of the land of Israel is for Jewish residence only) recall Southern Jim Crow laws and Germany's Nuremberg laws. But only a few bold critics have pointed out this double standard. Actually, it goes beyond normal double standards: it's the application of standards that are directly *opposite* to those the modern, more or less "liberal" Jews insist on elsewhere.

"Israel's right to exist" really means the right of Jews to dominate non-Jews. That is the foundation — the virtual constitution — of the Jewish state, and Jewish courts have ruled that non-Jews may not claim the same rights as Jews. Under the "right of return," any Jew in the world may "return" to Israel (even if none of his ancestors ever lived there) and immediately claim rights denied to Palestinians whose ancestors have lived there for untold centuries.

Such facts, along with Israel's heavy dependence on American aid, confirm the very stereotypes Jews constantly protest: of Jews as duplicitous "parasites" who recognize no moral obligations of Jews toward gentiles. So do Israeli espionage and technology theft against this country. The convicted spy Jonathan Pollard is widely celebrated as a national hero in Israel. And yet we are told, not only by Jews but by our own native prostitute politicians, that Israel is our "reliable ally" as well as a model of "democracy."

Before Zionism seemed to have any prospect of

The Irving-Lipstadt Trial

"A veteran lawyer, commenting on David Irving's disastrous lawsuit against Deborah Lipstadt and Penguin Books, asks a good question: Why do rightists, knowing how corrupt the legislative and executive branches are, think the judiciary is any better? Why turn for justice to an ambitious judge who knows what he can expect if he rules the wrong way? The forces who conspired to destroy a single dissident historian wouldn't stick at destroying a judge too, if necessary. Even his physical safety couldn't be assured."

— Joseph Sobran

success, many Jews thought Communism was "good for the Jews." Of course they also insisted that Communism was good for "the proletariat." Russia under the tsars didn't have much of a proletariat, but when it became the Soviet Union it was transformed into "the workers' paradise." Until the heroic Alexander Solzhenitsyn published his great trilogy, *The Gulag Archipelago*, in the 1970s (excerpts of which, be it noted, were carried in the *New York Times* under its Zionist editor Abe Rosenthal), the heavily-Jewish U.S. liberal media still maintained that the Russian people were far better off under Communism than under the despotic tsars.

In Germany, especially after Jewish-led Communist insurrections there and in Hungary and Romania, Hitler could argue plausibly that Soviet Communism showed what the Jews meant to do to other countries. Traditional suspicion was easily raised to a hysteria that found persecution not only permissible, but prudent. In America, Father Charles Coughlin, the radio priest, warned of Jewish Bolshevism too, cataloguing the real Jewish names of the Soviet ruling circles and accusing the Soviet regime of murdering 20 million Christians (a figure that later turned out to be far too low, according to Solzhenitsyn and others). Nevertheless, Stalin enjoyed widespread support from Jews around the world, even after his bloody purge of most Jewish members of the Soviet hierarchy.

Is there a "Jewish problem" in the United States today? In the media age, Jews prevail in the media — in television news, punditry, major newspapers, and Hollywood entertainment. They also constitute a powerful lobby, devoted to a range of liberal causes: feminism, "civil rights," legal abortion, banning religion from public places — whatever seems to irritate the Christian population. Many ethnic Jews (as well as many nominal but effectively apostate Christians) still carry what might be called the Bolshevik gene code.

But Jews are so powerful in this country that any mention of the Jewish angle in liberalism is taboo, whereas the interests of "the Christian Right" are freely reported, often with scornful overtones. As I have reason to know, a journalist may endanger his career by discussing Jewish interests in any light except a highly favorable one. An especially vivid illustration is provided by the media's concerted hate campaign against Pat Buchanan. Jewish power is such that even Jews in the media are themselves afraid of it.

To some extent this is merely the result of the Jews' success in a free society. They have enormous wealth and power, but they also have enormous talent and determination. They are "overachievers" from the cradle, and if there is one trait they surely have, it's the ability to focus on a long-term purpose. Despite an occasional Sandy Koufax, Jews are notoriously unathletic; but not necessarily because they lack physical ability. The chief reason is that they are serious. As the great Jewish polemicist Maurice Samuel explained, Jews have a general contempt for sports and games and don't waste their time on these gentile frivolities. Try to imagine a Jewish couch potato sitting in front of the television with a six-pack watching three football games in a row! It's hard to picture.

But their seriousness also shows in their vindictiveness. People who don't hate the Jews are nevertheless afraid of them, afraid of crossing them. Believing the mythology of their own eternal victimhood, the Jews (by and large) feel that criticism of them means persecution, and they are quick to paint swastikas on their critics. Given their inordinate power in the media, this means that the general public hears very little criticism of them, even when they deserve it. It amounts to private censorship. Jewish power inhibits free speech even when the press is absolutely free from government control.

Of course the Jews are only exercising their rights as property owners when they bar their critics from their networks and newspapers, but the result is still a severe curtailment of full public discussion. The news media not only inform, but "disinform" the public by suppressing both facts themselves and comment on those facts.

The general public has become accustomed to judging everything from a Jewish point of view. This is most striking — to me, anyway — in the constant harping on World War II, which has long since ceased revolving around Pearl Harbor and Japan and now centers obsessively on the "Holocaust" — a word never used during the war itself. We are taught that it is good that the United States won, because Hitler was destroyed. In fact, the real victor was Stalin, who quickly took ten Christian countries under Communist rule; but since Communism enjoyed a good deal of Jewish support and most of its victims were Christians, its role in the war is barely acknowledged. Even Jewish anti-Communists (of whom there are now many) say next to nothing about the savage Communist persecution of Christians. In contrast to the endless hunt for old Nazis, there has been no campaign to find and punish aging Communist criminals, or to exact reparations for the cruelty and suffering they inflicted.

Until recently, Jews passionately supported (and, to a large extent, controlled) the "civil rights movement," which was really a socialist campaign to extend the power of centralized government over private individuals and institutions. The unadmitted premise of the movement, ironically enough, was white supremacy and black inferiority. It was

assumed that black children couldn't get a proper education in segregated schools; only if they sat in classrooms with whites could they become achievers. But public schools, once integrated, didn't remain integrated long; whites fled as soon as they could.

Again, the alleged reason was "prejudice" — or what Bill Clinton would homiletically call "fear of those who are different," as in "the color of their skin." But whites weren't afraid of skin pigment; they were afraid of violence. They went to great lengths and great expense to escape it. Even liberals notoriously put their children in safe, that is, mostly white, schools. If sheer, irrational racial prejudice motivated "white flight" from black-dominated cities, it should also have made whites equally fearful of Orientals and other nonwhites.

There is an obvious difference between defensive and aggressive prejudices — a distinction liberalism doesn't acknowledge. When one group sees another group as threatening and is actually willing to pay a high price to avoid close contact with it, the prejudice would seem to have at least some foundation. The liberal response to this market judgment is to outlaw the market, making contact compulsory, without asking why such a policy is necessary. When such policies fail, liberals conclude that even more drastic policies must be imposed.

Even today, black "leaders" like Jesse Jackson appear to be white supremacists. Jackson admits that blacks pose a certain crime problem; he once confessed that when he hears footsteps behind him on a dark street, he is relieved if he turns and sees a white man. The huge disparity between interracial crime committed by blacks and that committed by whites — the ratio is about 50 to 1 — causes no comment; a violent crime committed by a white against a black makes national headlines.

The forbidden prejudice against blacks makes its appearance indirectly, in the low expectations everyone has of blacks (contrast the high expectations of Jews). Jackson and others, in making demands on whites, always imply that blacks are incapable of achievement on their own, outside the areas of sports, entertainment, and the performing arts; they can't even envision blacks as creators, inventors, innovators. They can see them only as recipients of white largess, cogs in the white man's economic machinery. Though they complain about the injustice of casting the black man in menial roles in the white man's world, they seem unable to conceive him as a builder of civilizations.

Jackson and his ilk may not realize it, but they constantly reinforce the idea that blacks aren't even capable of moral responsibility. By blaming the white man for everything, they teach that only the white man is morally autonomous, and that blacks can be only what the white man chooses to make them. The white man becomes the Superman — the black man's excuse for failure. Whatever Jackson's words say, this is what his actions mean. Nor do many others seem to disagree. As Bernard Shaw remarked, a man's deepest beliefs are to be inferred not from the creed he professes, but from the assumptions on which he habitually acts.

Outside of sports — where the black man is as secure in his domain as the Jew in his — most of the blacks who are celebrated for their "achievements" are political. That is what black "leaders" do: they fight to enlarge the power of the state, narrowing the white man's freedom and taking his money for racial purposes. The state is of course a coercive and parasitic institution, creating and producing nothing, dispensing to some only what it takes from others — "organized plunder," as Bastiat called it. Success in politics is nothing to be proud of.

Demands for "reparations" for blacks, for the "lingering effects" of slavery, overlook the fact that slavery is the one institution this country ever imported from Africa. Moreover, when slavery came here it was far more humane than the African kind: American slaves weren't mutilated or castrated as in the African "homeland." Since black leaders sentimentalize Africa (they now want to be called "African-Americans"), no reparations are demanded *of* the descendants of African slave merchants, while American whites are assigned total responsibility for the problems of today's blacks.

Nobody should be surprised if disreputable "stereotypes" continue to persist, since they often have the unintended but implicit sanction of the very people who deplore them. But a stereotype of any group is by its nature based on an external and usually unsympathetic view of that group. Despite liberal denials, the stereotype has some empirical validity; but it overlooks the internal life of the group — the variety, divisions, and arguments that make it impossible for the group to be monolithic. Every group bound by a set of traditions is also riven by bitterly conflicting interpretations of its traditions. Its members, keenly conscious of this, may justifiably feel that its critics don't really understand the complications that underlie the behavior that outsiders find objectionable.

By the same token, minorities have their own prejudices and stereotypes, also with some basis in experience of majority behavior. The success of so many black and Jewish comedians is largely due to their perspective as members of outnumbered and culturally overwhelmed races who have kept their ability to see the absurdities of which members of the majority are unconscious. It's a happy comment on human nature that the majority itself often finds such caricatures of itself hilarious.

Of course stereotypes can also be favorable, respectful, and even affectionate. Jews are universally respected for their intelligence, and Jewish celebrities are often loved precisely for the qualities that make them seem "Jewish." Blacks in movies were often portrayed as earthy, warm, dignified, and wise, at least until fashion decided that benevolence toward whites was Uncle Tommish, with "black pride" prescribing an attitude of rancor and menace. Most whites still see Orientals as polite and industrious. The Irish and Italians, formerly typed as drunks and mafiosi, are now the subjects of benign stereotypes. Yet in their day, the old stereotypes probably had their measure of truth and utility.



"Diversity is our greatest strength," said President Clinton in his State of the Union address, February 4, 1997.

According to Bill Clinton's mantra, "Diversity is our greatest strength." Though Clinton has made a career of pandering to minorities (including sexual deviants), it is still true that we should delight in human variety. But there are limits; society also needs unity and an orthodoxy more solid than liberal bromides.

The Forgiven Holocaust

The columnist Sidney Zion of the New York *Daily News,* a forthright partisan of Israel's Likud faction, has qualified his celebration of his hero Franklin D. Roosevelt by charging him with indifference to "the extermination of the Jews of Europe" during World War II. It's a little surprising that Zion's admiration for Roosevelt can survive such a qualification at all.

Zion cites Edmund Burke's famous aphorism: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." He comments: "FDR did next to nothing to stop the massacre of the Six Million, a fact that has been established by historical documentation running back at least 20 years. If ever there was a 'good man,' it was Roosevelt, and if ever evil triumphed, it was the Holocaust."

Well, evil has triumphed on a number of other occasions, and on one of them this "good man" was likewise indifferent. Soon after taking office as president in 1933, Roosevelt extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union, which was already establishing its record as the most murderous regime of all time. Specifically, it had pursued agricultural "collectivization" by confiscating harvest and starving Ukraine into submission. Low estimates put the number of dead at seven million; the highest estimate is 13 million. In some places it was reported that dead children were not even being buried; they were being eaten.

The Ukraine famine is sometimes called "the Forgotten Holocaust." It might better be called the Forgiven Holocaust. The anti-Communist Hearst papers covered it extensively at the time, thereby incurring the wrath of liberals. (Orson Welles portrayed William Randolph Hearst as a corrupt capitalist in "Citizen Kane.") But Walter Duranty of the *New York Times,* eager for Stalin's favor, denied that there was any starvation in Ukraine and won a Pulitzer for his reportage. His Pulitzer has never been revoked; the *Times* continues to honor him among its stellar journalists of the past.

Privately, by the way, Duranty admitted to the British ambassador in Moscow that as many as 15 million had died. That his estimate may have been high only underlines his mendacity. He gave the American establishment an excuse for ignoring Communist crimes which had been amply confirmed by others, and which made most of Europe terrified of Communism between the wars. In any case, Roosevelt had no excuse. No president depends entirely on the *Times* for his information.

Since Pius XII is (falsely) accused of "silence" about the Nazi persecution of the Jews, it is worth mentioning that his predecessor Pius XI was far more "silent" about the Ukrainian famine and, later, the equally great Soviet purges of the later 1930s. Popes rarely commented on specific events; they condemned Communism and Nazi racialism in principle and felt it unnecessary, or unavailing, to add detailed condemnations when evil principles were put into practice.

Of course those who condemn Pius XII for silence about the murder of Jews don't condemn Pius XI for silence about the murder of Ukrainians and others. But neither do they condemn Roosevelt or anyone else for overlooking the Communist horrors. This gross double standard is a key to understanding not only Roosevelt's time, but our own.

If the official world had condemned and quarantined the Soviet Union for its "democide" (an apt word coined by Professor R. J. Rummel), Hitler himself might have thought twice about imitating that precedent whose numbers of victims he never even approached. Today liberal opinion condemns "Holo-

Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin, the Allied "Big Three," at the Yalta Conference, February 1945, where they agreed on plans for postwar global hegemony by the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain.

caust denial" that has no effect on events long past; but it maintains its own silence on the timely denials of Communist horrors *while they were happening* — denials that not only helped them to continue, but allowed the killers to escape punishment and censure.

Later, when the numbers of Soviet victims had surpassed the total number of the dead of World War I, Roosevelt's generosity to Stalin and the Soviet Union actually increased. He gave Stalin aid against Germany, eagerly formed an alliance with him, and praised him as a great ally in the democratic war against "fascism." He even pressured Warner Brothers to produce a major motion picture, "Mission to Moscow," portraying Stalin as the benign grandfather of the Russian people. The film was based on the memoir of Joseph Davies, Roosevelt's former ambassador to Moscow; Davies defended even Stalin's purges, taking the view that anyone Stalin killed probably got what was coming to him.

While all this was going on, Hitler was not alone in blaming Communism on the Jews. Secularized Jews had been prominent in the first generation of Soviet leadership; and even after Stalin had purged those Jews, other Jewish intellectuals, propagandists, and activists were conspicuous in the world Communist movement. Many Europeans crudely equated Jews with Communism. This fact in no way justifies the slightest violation of the rights of Jews, but it does explain the readiness of many Germans to follow Hitler and the preference of many others for Hitlerite over Stalinist rule. With war looming, most people forget morality and think of their own hides. Besides, in the late 1930s Hitler was not even in the mass murder business yet; Stalin was.

This whole side of the period between the wars, officially ignored at the time, is officially forgotten now. It has become customary to speak as if Hitler arose in a vacuum, the German masses followed him out of sheer malevolence, and the French collaborated with him out of sheer cowardice. Today anyone who even advocated neutrality toward Hitler is condemned; the America First movement and other "isolationists" are spoken of as if they had actually been pro-Hitler.

That view is tenable only if you pretend that Communism didn't exist. Hitler's unforgivable acts were made possible by the people who forgave Stalin everything. But Roosevelt's latter-day admirers see no moral connection between his friendship for the Soviet Union and his indifference to the extermination of Jews.

After Roosevelt's death the extent of his administration's secret favors to the Soviets became exposed and was seen in a very different light. The revelation that Alger Hiss and many others had been active Soviet agents led to the McCarthy era. The liberal intellectuals' condemnation of "McCarthyism" was of a piece with their general ridicule of the very idea of a Communist "threat." For them Communism had been the Great Progressive Hope, and they had far more pity for "victims of McCarthyism" who had lost sensitive government jobs than for the millions of victims of Communism who had lost their lives and freedoms. (Professor Rummel puts the number of dead under Soviet Communism at nearly 62 million.)

"Victims of Communism" is not a phrase that rolls easily off liberal lips. The huge, tax-supported Holocaust Museum near the Mall today commemorates the victims of Nazism, chiefly Jewish, but also gypsy, homosexual, whatever. (The victims of Communism may have a plaque somewhere. Who knows?)

Liberals, Zionists, and "responsible" conservatives now occupy a rhetorically Hitlercentric universe, in which Nazism is the measure of all evil and Roosevelt is redeemed by his determination to crush Germany. The stain of guilt for Nazism constantly spreads — to ordinary Germans, allies of Germany, neutrals, isolationists, Swiss bankers, and Pius XII himself. The stain even spreads backward in time, to pre-Hitler anti-Semites, Martin Luther, Christian culture in general, even (according to the filmstrip shown at the Holocaust Museum) to the authors of the Gospels. In a new theory of causation, even the slightest historical injustice to Jews "led to" the Holocaust. Scholarly books, popular movies, and everyday rhetoric are saturated with this theme. Everyone and everything are measured on a single scale, which might be called the Hitler Continuum.

But there is no corresponding Stalin Continuum.

Those who aided and defended and celebrated Stalin at the height of his crimes incur no guilt or obloquy. To have dreamed the Communist dream is evidence of idealism, not guilt or even irresponsibility. Under "McCarthyism" Communists actually became victims themselves! Books, movies, and rhetoric dramatize the plight of innocent Communists in the America of the 1950s. Old Communists like Lillian Hellman can publish their memoirs of persecution — how they suffered firing, blacklisting, or sharp questioning by the House Un-American Activities Committee — and be hailed as heroes and champions of *liberty,* no less, even if it took them until 1956, the year of Khrushchev's famous denunciation, to see the error of Stalin's ways.

Khrushchev, after all, didn't repudiate Communism; he merely accused Stalin of having betrayed it. How? By murdering countless innocent people? No, by purging loyal Party members!

So the stain of Communist guilt, far from spreading metaphysically, shrinks to one man, the erstwhile "Uncle Joe." He and he alone is blamed for all that carnage. We don't even ask what "led to" such astounding violence and terror, let alone why he enjoyed such complicity by powerful, influential, intelligent, and seemingly respectable people. Even Stalin's warmest admirers and benefactors aren't tainted; that would be "guilt by association," a McCarthyite tactic.

Certain shoes, for some reason, are never put on the other foot. Imagine what would be said today of a president who had given Hitler a little help when he needed it. Or an ambassador who had written eulogies to Nazi jurisprudence. Or a reporter who had written from Berlin that Jews weren't being abused in the Third Reich. Or an "idealist" who had seen Nazi Germany as the hope of mankind.

You don't have to imagine a world in which people are forgiven for doing the same things for the Soviet Union. You're living in that world right now.

The Black Book

It's always easy to start an uproar in France: just say something critical of Communism. The latest such uproar has resulted from an 800-page tome titled *The Black Book of Communism,* by the historian Stephane Courtois, which enumerates in considerable detail the mass murders of the Soviet, Maoist, and other Communist regimes.

Courtois writes provocatively: "Recent emphasis on the singularity of the genocide of the Jews, by concentrating attention on an exceptional atrocity, blurs our perception of affairs of the same order in the Communist world." "The child of a Ukrainian kulak deliberately starved to death by the Stalinist regime is worth no less than a Jewish child in the Warsaw ghetto starved to death by the Nazi regime." "The fact is that Communist regimes committed crimes affecting about 100 million people, against some 25 million for Nazism."

These quotations are taken for the *New York Times,* where the very occurrence of the Ukrainian famine was denied, even as it was still in progress, by the reporter Walter Duranty, who got a Pulitzer prize for his mendacious efforts. The paper has never repudiated Duranty, and it continues to list him proudly among its Pulitzer winners.

Writing about Courtois' book on the paper's Dec. 22nd [1997] op-ed page, Tony Judt draws this moral: "The tale of human cruelty in our times is too complicated and variegated to be captured by ideological labels alone, whether 'left' or 'right'." But it's not just a problem of abstract "human cruelty." It's a practical problem of state power. A limitless state that doesn't feel bound by divine or natural law is capable of anything.

Even the most notoriously harsh of Christian states — Spain during its Inquisition — claimed no authority to kill people en masse. Never mind whether Spain deserved its reputation among Protestants; even the highest estimates of its victims 30,000 over more than three centuries, probably five times the actual total) doesn't approach the slaughters of the modern state. The reason is simple: The accused had to be tried and executed as individuals. In each case, the state had to make some showing of personal guilt.

The modern state abolished guilt and embraced determinism. This was supposed to be a humane philosophy, relieving the individual of responsibility. But in practice it relieved the state of responsibility. Since people were mere passive products of racial or economic causation, their undesirable behavior (from the state's point of view) could be inferred and predicted from their membership in certain social categories. So it became rational to round them up and exterminate them, on the most advanced and enlightened principles of social science.

So why was Communism excused by so many intellectuals for so long? Judt explains that "we are still heirs to the victorious alliance with the Communists that defeated Hitler — in Nazism was Absolute Evil, then the allies who helped us destroy it cannot be utterly evil themselves." But he goes on to say that "many' of Communism's Western sympathizers, unlike fascism's, were "well-intentioned." Well, that takes care of that!

But Communism had already claimed millions of lives before World War II, when the Nazi murders began. By the 1930s countless Russian refugees had poured into Western Europe with grim accounts of the atrocities that began under Lenin *and acceler-*

ated under Stalin. Anyone who really wanted to know already knew, by then, what Communism was. Those who didn't want to know had no excuse, then or later.

It's time to acknowledge that the man Congress has honored with a huge memorial, Franklin D. Roosevelt, was the greatest ally Communism ever had. It's inconceivable that Congress would honor anyone who had given Nazi Germany comparable aid and sympathy: Roosevelt once even dared to compare the US and Soviet constitutions, assuring Americans that the Soviets guaranteed freedom of religion, too, in their own way. (This was perhaps the only occasion on which he showed the slightest respect for the US Constitution.)

Duranty's Denials

In an important and specific way, Walter Duranty of the *New York Times* may have been the most influential journalist of the twentieth century. He was the wrong man at the right time, and his reportage helped change the course of events to a degree that few reporters ever have. It's a pity that Stalin wasn't more grateful to him.

During the 1930s the Soviet Union needed all the Western support it could get. But it had a bad reputation because it was, to put the matter in simple terms, killing a lot of people. Western and Central Europe were terrified of Bolshevism and of the Bolshevist movement that was spreading through other countries.

The killing reached a peak in the forced famine of 1932-3, as Stalin's "agricultural policy" punished recalcitrant Ukrainian and Kazakh peasants who rebelled against the confiscation of their lands and harvests. Nobody knows how many starved; historians's estimates range from three to twelve million.

At the time, Duranty reckoned the figure toward the high end of the scale — at around twenty million. That was his private guess, anyway. Publicly, in his dispatches to the Times, he said there was no evidence of any famine. (His story is told in S. J. Taylor's brisk biography, *Stalin's Apologist* [reviewed in the Winter 1991 *Journal*]).

Duranty, a learned, cynically witty Englishman with a wooden leg, was the most respected foreign correspondent in Moscow. His word carried weight even when it was false; other journalists followed his lead or were afraid to contradict him. He was never a believing Communist, but he sympathized with Stalin's efforts to subdue a huge country and he saw his opportunity. Holding ordinary people in contempt, he was unmoved by the terrible suffering they endured at the hands of the man he admired not as a Marxist leader of the masses, but as a sort of Nietzschean hero.

Anyone who reported Stalin's atrocities to the West could expect to be expelled and to cause his paper's Moscow bureau to be shut down; travel was restricted, and most correspondents based their reports on what they read in the Soviet press. But a few, notably Malcolm Muggeridge of the *Manchester Guardian* (who boldly took an unauthorized tour of Ukraine), nevertheless reported honestly.

Honesty, however, was no temptation for Duranty. He lied. For his services he received a rare exclusive interview with Stalin himself; he was awarded a Pulitzer Prize; he enjoyed the high life in the midst of proletarian poverty, keeping a mistress and a small son in his spacious Moscow apartment. For Walter Duranty, Communism paid off in caviar.

All the Western governments knew of the famine through their embassies, but none dared to denounce the Soviet regime for fear of diplomatic reprisal. Duranty's version became the more or less official version for everyone: What famine? Reports of it in the Western press were so spotty that it was hard for the public to believe them or at least to keep them in mind for long. Duranty's denials were enough to confuse Western opinion and to make the huge famine seem unreal to the outside world.

His fiction, propagated through the Paper of Record, gave the Roosevelt Administration cover to extend diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union in late 1933. Duranty was appropriately present at the White House ceremony at which the Soviet ambassador was formally received. He enjoyed a celebrity rare among journalists then, and he wrote a memoir, *As I Please,* which became a best-seller.

One of his many distinguished friends in Moscow was Roosevelt's ambassador, Joseph Davies, another Stalin apologist (more sincere than Duranty), whose 1941 book *Mission to Moscow* became a major Warner Brothers picture, filmed at the urging of Roosevelt himself. Davies was so deluded that he argued that the difference between Communism and Nazism was that Communism was compatible with Christianity — that if it had been expressly grounded on Christian principles, "it would probably be declared to be one of the greatest efforts of Christian altruism in history to translate the ideals of brotherhood and charity as preached by the gospel of Christ into a government by men."

"That is the difference," Davies added: "the communistic Soviet state could function with the Christian religion in its basic purpose to serve the brotherhood of man. It would be impossible for the Nazi state to do so. The communistic ideal is that the state may evaporate and be no longer necessary as man advances into a perfect brotherhood. The Nazi idea is the exact opposite — that the state is the supreme end of all." The Soviet government even guaranteed "constitutional protection for civil

and religious liberty." The Soviet "leaders" were moved by "altruistic concepts," "ethical ideals," and "spiritual aspirations" and were "devoted to peace." "To the Red Army which stands at the ramparts of our civilization, to the Soviet government and the Soviet people, we owe a measureless debt." And much more in the same vein. For Davies, the Soviet system, though somewhat rough-hewn and not quite on a par with American democracy, was nevertheless synonymous with "the brotherhood of man."

"Thus," he concluded, "it is bad Christianity, bad sportsmanship, bad sense to challenge the integrity of the Soviet government. Premier Stalin has repeatedly told the world that the Soviet government seeks no territory in this war. It does not seek to impose its will on other peoples."

Duranty would never have been fatuous enough to write such words. But he was living in a climate where some powerful men were fatuous enough to believe them, and he took full advantage of the fact for his own purposes.

Knowledgeable people, including the foreign press corps in Moscow, understood perfectly well that Duranty was lying for Stalin's favor. Some of his colleagues, Eugene Lyons among them, had also begun as Communist sympathizers, but changed their minds and came to despise his urbane mendacity, which lacked even their excuse: their perverse conviction that they were merely concealing the blemishes of an essentially good cause. In time his reputation subtly eroded and his drinking took its toll on his talent. After he left Moscow he could for a time support his lavish and thriftless habits by public speaking in America, but finally even this became a strain.

In the late 1940s Duranty, now living in New York, decided to attempt a comeback by writing a book, which was to be called *Stalin's Russia*. He intended neither to repeat nor to repudiate his lies, but merely to edge away from them; a skillful writer, he could change his tune without overtly changing his story. But when word of his plans got out, he received a letter from his former mistress in Moscow warning him obliquely that if his book displeased Stalin, she and their son would be in danger. Such was the gratitude he earned from the Soviet strongman he had served so well. One wonders how this cynical man felt about Stalin's even more ruthless cynicism.

Curiously, Duranty incurred no special notoriety during the Cold War and the McCarthy era, though nobody had earned notoriety as he had. He was ignored and forgotten, living largely on loans, never repaid, from his faithful and generous friend John Gunther. His career and health continued to decline until his death in the 1970s.

To this day, Duranty's Pulitzer for foreign correspondence has never been revoked. The fact says something about liberalism's attitude toward Communism. Liberals would have reacted very differently to a journalist who had reported from Berlin that Jews weren't being mistreated by Hitler, thereby enabling the slaughter to proceed. But Duranty's lies were in keeping with the liberal agenda; in a sense, they still are. Even now liberalism would rather stigmatize anti-Communists than Communists. Stalin's greatest benefactor has just been honored with a grand memorial in Washington.

In many Western countries it is actually a crime to deny that Hitler's mass murders occurred, though such denials can't change the facts. But Duranty's denials of the Great Famine did change the facts, allowing the famine to continue with impunity. They may even have helped save Communism by making possible Stalin's profitable alliance with Roosevelt.

In a way, Duranty eventually paid for his corruption. But not nearly as much as the rest of the world has paid for it.

A Warning from an American Historian

"... Today we must face the discouraging prospect that we all, teachers and pupils alike, have lost much of what this earlier generation possessed, the priceless asset of a shared culture ... Many of the young practitioners of our craft, and those who are still apprentices, are products of lower middle-class or foreign origins, and their emotions not infrequently get in the way of historical reconstructions. They find themselves in a very real sense outsiders on our past and feel themselves shut out. This is certainly not their fault, but it is true. They have no experience to assist them, and the chasm between them and the Remote Past widens every hour ... What I fear is that the changes observant in the background and training of the present generation will make it impossible for them to communicate to and reconstruct the past for future generations."

— Carl Bridenbaugh, president of the American Historical Association, 1963. Quoted in Kevin MacDonald, *Separation and its Discontents* (1998), pp. 82-83.

"When regard for truth has been broken down or even slightly weakened, all things will remain doubtful."

— St. Augustine (354-430).

Faurisson's Three Letters to *Le Monde* (1978-1979)

On December 29, 1978, a short item headed "'The Problem of the Gas Chambers' or 'The Rumor of Auschwitz'," appeared in the pages of France's most influential daily paper, Le Monde. *With the publication of this piece, written by a professor of literature at the University of Lyon II, the "Faurisson affair" burst into public awareness. In the same issue of the paper were also several anti-revisionist articles, including one entitled "Abundance of Proofs" by the Jewish scholar Georges Wellers.*

On the basis of the "right of reply," provided for in French law, Faurisson responded to the barrage of attacks with a second letter in Le Monde *on January 16, 1979. His adversaries struck back a few weeks later with further items in the issue of February 21, including a solemn declaration drafted by two leading French Jewish intellectuals, Léon Poliakov and Pierre Vidal-Naquet. This declaration, signed by 34 historians, responded to Faurisson's provocative question about how, precisely and technically, the alleged wartime homicidal gassings were carried out by German authorities. In words that amount to an expression of intellectual bankruptcy, the 34 historians declared:*

> *It must not be asked how, technically, such a mass murder was possible. It was technically possible given that it took place. That is the requisite point of departure of any historical inquiry on this subject. It is incumbent upon us to simply state this truth: there is not, there cannot be, any debate about the existence of the gas chambers.*

Still under fierce attack in the pages of Le Monde, *Faurisson sent yet another "right of reply" letter to the Paris daily, this one entitled "One proof ... one single proof."* Le Monde, *doubtless alarmed at the extent to which the affair had grown, refused to publish it. At the same time, though, the paper invited his adversaries to continue their attacks.*

In the decades since he wrote those Le Monde *items, Prof. Faurisson has broadened and refined his outlook in interviews, books and numerous letters and essays. It goes without saying that, on such or such a point, he might today express himself differently. In his letter of January 16, 1979, for example, he almost certainly would not write as he did of the well-known January 1943 Bishoff letter, and its* "Vergasungskeller" *reference. (On this, see A. Butz in the July-Aug. 1997* Journal of Historical Review, *pp. 20-23, and S. Crowell in the July-Aug. 1999* Journal, *pp. 16-17.)*

Those who are familiar with the development of revisionist scholarship over the years may note that occasionally someone will trumpet as his "discovery" something that, in fact, had already been found and announced by Robert Faurisson in 1978-1979. In 1992, for example, a young Jewish-American revisionist named David Cole made quite a fuss over the fact that a young female Polish guide of the Auschwitz State Museum told him, and tourists, that the Auschwitz I "gas chamber" is "in its original state," even though a prominent Museum official told him, on film, that this "gas chamber" is only "very similar" to the original. However, Faurisson had already pointed out this contradiction in his January 16, 1979, Le Monde *letter. Of course, this room is not at all "very similar" to an original "gas chamber," and portraying it as such amounts to an outright fake — as Museum officials more or less acknowledged in 1994. (See R. Faurisson, "The 'Gas Chamber' of Auschwitz I," Sept.-Dec. 1999* Journal of Historical Review, *pp. 12-13.)*

In spite of the passage of time, Faurisson's three Le Monde *items are still valuable, not only for an understanding of the development of revisionist scholarship, but as trenchant presentations of important revisionist arguments about the "Holocaust." Here, then, are authorized English translations of the complete texts of these three landmark essays.*

— The Editor

'The Problem of the Gas Chambers'[1] or 'The Rumor of Auschwitz'

No one questions the use of crematories in certain German camps. The mere frequency of epidemics throughout Europe at war demanded the cremation, for example, of the bodies of typhus victims (see the photographs).

It is the existence of "gas chambers," veritable slaughterhouses for humans, that is called into question. Since 1945, the questioning has been growing. The mass media is aware of this.

In 1945, the official historiography affirmed that the "gas chambers" had functioned in the former [pre-1938 German] Reich as well as in Austria, Alsace and Poland. Fifteen years later, in 1960, it revised its judgment: "gas chambers" had operated, "above all" (?), only in Poland.[2] This drastic revision of 1960 reduced to naught a thousand "testimonies," a thousand "proofs" of supposed gassings at Oranienburg, at Buchenwald, at Bergen-Belsen, at Dachau, at Ravensbrück, at Mauthausen. Appearing before British or French judicial bodies, the heads of Ravensbrück camp (Suhren, Schwarzhuber, Dr. Treite) had admitted the existence of a "gas chamber" whose functioning they had even, in a

Robert Faurisson addresses the 13th IHR Conference, May 29, 2000, in Irvine, California.

vague manner, described. A comparable scenario had been acted out by Ziereis, of Mauthausen, or by Kramer, of Struthof. After the deaths of the condemned men, it was discovered that those gassings had never taken place. Flimsiness of testimonies and confessions!

The "gas chambers" of Poland — as will surely be admitted in time — were no more real. It is to the Polish and Soviet judicial bodies that we owe most of our information about them (see, for instance, the horrifying confession of R. Höss, *Commandant of Auschwitz*).

Today's visitor to Auschwitz or Majdanek discovers, in the way of "gas chambers," facilities in which any gassings would have spelled catastrophe for the gassers and their entourage. A collective execution by gas, supposing that it were practicable, cannot at all be likened either to a suicidal or to an accidental gassing. In order to gas a single convict at a time, with his wrists and ankles shackled, the Americans employ a special gas [hydrogen cyanide] within a small space, from which, after its use, it is extracted and subsequently neutralized. So then, how could two thousand people (and even three thousand) be held in an enclosure of 210 square meters (!), at Auschwitz, for example, to have a common and powerful insecticide called Zyklon B poured onto them; finally, just after the victims' deaths, how could a team be sent, without gas masks, into that place saturated with hydrogen cyanide, in order to remove the corpses infused with cyanide? Some too little-known documents[3] show, moreover: 1) That the structure in question [at Auschwitz-Birkenau *Krema* II], which the Germans are said to have blown up shortly before their departure, was nothing but a typical morgue (*Leichenkeller*), built underground (to protect it from the warmth of the air) and fitted with a single small door for entry and exit; 2) That the Zyklon B could not be evacuated by a rapid ventilation, and that it needed at least 21 hours to evaporate. Whereas thousands of documents on the Auschwitz crematories (including invoices precise to the last Pfennig) are in our possession, there exists neither a directive to build, nor a study, nor an order of material, nor a blueprint, nor a bill, nor any photograph, as regards the "gas chambers," which, we are told, adjoined those crematories. At a hundred trials (Jerusalem, Frankfurt, etc.), no evidence has been produced.

"I was at Auschwitz. There were no 'gas chambers' there." Those who dare bear witness on behalf of the accused by pronouncing that sentence are hardly listened to. They are prosecuted. Still in 1978, anyone in Germany who speaks out in favor of Thies Christophersen, author of "*The Auschwitz Lie*," risks a conviction for "defaming the memory of the dead."

After the war, the International Red Cross (which had investigated "the rumor of Auschwitz"),[4] the Vatican (which had been quite well informed about Poland), the Nazis, the collaborators, all declared, along with many others: "The 'gas chambers'? We did not know." But how can one know of things that did not exist?

Nazism is dead and gone, together with its Führer. There remains today the truth. Let us dare to proclaim it. The non-existence of the "gas chambers" is good news for poor humanity. Good news that it would be wrong to keep hidden any longer.[5]

— *Le Monde,* December 29, 1978, p. 8.

A Letter from Mr. Faurisson

Until 1960, I believed in the reality of those gigantic massacres in "gas chambers." Then, upon reading Paul Rassinier, a wartime *résistant* and deportee who had written *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse*, I began to have doubts. After 14 years of personal reflection, then four years of sustained research, I became certain, as have 20 other revisionist authors, that I had before me a historical lie. I have visited and revisited Auschwitz and Birkenau where the authorities exhibit a "reconstituted gas chamber"[6] together with remains said to be those of "crematories with gas chambers". At Struthof (Alsace) and at Majdanek (Poland), I have examined the buildings presented as "gas chambers in their original state." I have analyzed thousands of documents, particularly at the Paris Centre de documen-

tation juive contemporaine: archives, transcripts, photographs, written testimonies. I have tirelessly pursued specialists and historians with my questions. I have tried to find, but in vain, a single deportee who could prove to me that he had really seen, with his own eyes, a "gas chamber." I especially did not want an illusory abundance of evidence; I was willing to settle for one proof, one single proof. I have never found that proof. What I have found, on the contrary, is much false evidence, worthy of the witchcraft trials, dishonoring the judges who have admitted it. And then I have found silence, embarrassment, hostility, leading finally to slander, insults, and physical blows.

Paul Rassinier (1906-1967)

The retorts recently prompted by my brief piece on "The Rumor of Auschwitz" are those I have read more than once in 18 years of research. I do not call into question the sincerity of their authors, but I will say that they are teeming with errors long since pointed out by the likes of Rassinier, [Franz] Scheidl and [Arthur] Butz.

For example, in the letter of January 29, 1943, (bearing the regular mention "Secret") which is quoted to me, *Vergasung* does not signify "gassing," but rather "carburetion." *Vergasungskeller* designates the room, below ground, in which the "gaseous" mixture that fed the crematory oven was prepared. This oven and others like it were supplied by the firm Topf & Sons, of Erfurt (Doc. NO-4473).

Begasung designated the gassing of clothing in autoclaves. If the gas used was Zyklon B - "B[lausäure] preparation," that is, Prussic acid or hydrogen cyanide - then "blue gas chambers" were mentioned. Nothing to do with the purported "slaughterhouse gas chambers"!

The Diary of physician Johann Paul Kremer must be cited correctly. It will thus be seen that, if he speaks of the horrors of Auschwitz, it is in allusion to the horrors of the typhus epidemic of September-October 1942. On October 3 he wrote: "At Auschwitz, whole streets have been annihilated by typhus." He himself would contract what is called "the Auschwitz disease." Germans died of it. The sorting of the sick and the well was the "selection," or one of the forms of "special action," carried out by physicians. This sorting was done either inside the buildings or outdoors. Never did Kremer write that Auschwitz was a *Vernichtungslager*, that is, in the terminology invented by the Allies after the war, an "extermination camp" (by which is to be understood: a *camp equipped* with a "gas chamber"). In reality, he wrote: "It is not for nothing that Auschwitz is called the annihilation camp (*das Lager der Vernichtung*)." In the etymological sense of the word, typhus annihilates those whom it strikes. Another serious translation error: under the date of September 2, 1942, Kremer's manuscript reads: "At three a.m. today I was, for the first time, present at a special action outdoors." Historians and judges traditionally suppress the word "outdoors" (*draussen*) to have Kremer appear to say that the action in question took place in a "gas chamber." Finally, the horrid scenes before the "last Bunker" (that is, in the yard of Bunker 11) are executions of the condemned, executions that the physician was obliged to attend. Among the condemned there were three women who had arrived in a convoy from Holland: they were shot.[7]

The "*Krema*" buildings of Birkenau were perfectly visible to all.[8] A good number of plans and photographs prove this, and they prove as well the thorough material impossibility that these "*Kremas*" could have contained "gas chambers."

If, with regard to Auschwitz, someone quotes to me, yet once again, the confessions, memoirs, or miraculously unearthed manuscripts (with which I am already acquainted), I shall ask to be shown in what way the imprecise precision of their information differs from the imprecise precision of the information in all the documents which led the Allied military tribunals to rule that there were "gas chambers" where, in the end, it has since been acknowledged that there were none: for example, in the whole of the former Reich!

In my article I cited the [Nuremberg] industrial documents NI-9098 and 9912. One should read these before countering what I say about the "testimonies" of Pery Broad and R. Höss, or (why not?) the "confessions," made after the war, by J. P. Kremer. These documents establish that Zyklon B was not in the category of gasses considered susceptible to ventilation; its makers had to agree that it was "difficult to remove by ventilation because it sticks to surfaces." In carrying out a chemical test to prove the disappearance of the gas from its confines, a room infused with cyanide by Zyklon B fumigation can be entered only by someone wearing a gas mask fitted with a "J" filter – the very strongest – after approximately 20 hours.[9] Mattresses and blankets must be beaten in the open air for between one and two hours. Nevertheless, Höss wrote:[10] "Half an hour after the start of gassing, the door was opened and the ventilation device turned on. The removal of



In this detail from an Allied aerial reconnaissance photograph taken of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp on August 25, 1944, one can plainly see crematory facilities (*Kremas*) II (top) and III (bottom) where hundreds of thousands of Jews were allegedly killed in gas chambers. In none of the many photos taken of the camp during this period — including reconnaissance photos taken on random days in 1944 — is there any trace of the mass extermination supposedly being carried out at the time.

the bodies began immediately." Immediately (*sofort*)! And he goes on to add that the team, assigned to handle two thousand cyanide-infused corpses, entered the place (which was still full of gas, was it not?) and took them out while "eating and smoking," that is, if I understand correctly, without any gas masks. That is impossible. All the testimonies, as vague or conflicting as they may be about the rest,[11] agree at least on this point: the crew opened the chamber either immediately or "shortly following" the victims' deaths. I say that this point, in itself, constitutes the touchstone of the false testimony.

In Alsace, the Struthof camp's "gas chamber" is interesting to visit. The confession of Joseph Kramer can be read on the spot. It was through a "hole" (sic) that Kramer poured a "certain quantity of hydrogen cyanide salts," then, "a certain quantity of water," a mixture giving off a gas that killed in about one minute. The "hole" that is seen today was made in so sloppy a manner, with a chisel, that four earthenware tiles were broken. Kramer used a "funnel with a tap." I cannot see how he could keep the gas from coming back out of this crude hole, or how he could thus willingly allow that gas, leaving the chimney, to spread toward the windows of his own house. Moving on to an adjacent room, I would like to have an explanation of this business of the corpses preserved by Professor Hirt in "vats of formaldehyde solution" that are, in fact, nothing but vats for sauerkraut and potatoes, with simple, non-airtight wooden lids.

The most commonplace weapon, if suspected of having killed or wounded someone, is subjected to forensic examination. It will be noted with some surprise that these prodigious criminal weapons — the "gas chambers" — have never been subjected to any official examination (whether legal, scientific, or archaeological) whose report may be examined.[12] If, tragically, the Germans had won the war, I suppose that their concentration camps would have been presented to us as re-education camps. By questioning such a presentation of the facts, I should doubtless have found myself accused of being an objective ally of "Judeo-Marxism." I am neither objectively nor subjectively a Judeo-Marxist nor a neo-Nazi. I feel admiration for those Frenchmen who courageously struggled against Nazism. They defended the right cause. If today I state that the "gas chambers" did not exist, it is because the difficult duty to be truthful obliges me to say so.

[In accordance with the law of July 29, 1881, we hereby publish Mr. Faurisson's text. Any response directed against him or his statements would in turn offer him a new right of reply.

Nonetheless, we do not consider the case opened by Darquier de Pellepoix's declarations to be closed.][13]

— *Le Monde*, January 16, 1979, p. 13.

One Proof ... One Single Proof

In a lengthy declaration, 34 French historians have recently let us know that it is of course "natural" to ask oneself all sorts of questions about the Second World War, but that, nonetheless, "there is not, there cannot be, any debate about the existence of the gas chambers."

For my part, I remark that there is a debate about the existence or the non-existence of the "gas chambers," and I believe that this debate is a legitimate one. It has for a long time pitted a few specialists of the school of revisionist historians against a few specialists of the official history. This debate opened, in a way, in 1960 when Dr. Martin Broszat, representing the very official Institute for Contemporary History in Munich, had to make a huge concession to the revisionist Paul Rassinier: he was obliged to acknowledge that in spite of an alleged over-abundance of evidence, documents, testimonies and confessions (all of them reliable), not a single "gas chamber" ever existed in any of the concentration camps in the former Reich. In 1968, the discussion was revived, on the official side, by Olga Wormser-Migot who, in the face of a veritable storm of protest, dared to speak, in her thesis, of what she then termed "the problem of the gas chambers," Since 1974, this debate has little by little become a public one in western Europe and in the English-speaking world at large (including, just recently, Australia!). The French press can no longer ignore this, lest it practice a form of censorship.

This debate is already richly instructive. An attentive reader of *Le Monde* will have learned much just from a perusal of the February 21, 1979, issue, where a whole page was exclusively devoted to a rendering of the official history's arguments. To begin, the reader will have learned that, in certain camps, fake "gas chambers" are presented to "pilgrims and tourists" (the only pity is that he is not told the names of those camps). Then, he will have learned that the figure for Auschwitz of three million dead is "surely an exaggeration," news that will come as a surprise if he recalls that the official figure is four million. He will have noted that, in places where the German archives are declared to be "silent,"[14] there is a tendency to interpret them. He will have seen that, where Third Reich documents are "apparently innocuous," they are interpreted to the point, for example, of saying that "to treat accordingly" signifies ... "to gas." He will have noted that the orders of Himmler either to build or to destroy the "gas chambers" are not in the least precise, the fact being that such orders apparently never existed. He will have learned that the "document" of the SS engineer Gerstein is deemed "unquestionable," not in its entirety but "for the most part." With a bit more attention, he will have noted that, according to the passages *of the* [Gerstein] document that those in charge care to quote to him, there were from 700 to 800 persons in a "gas chamber" whose area was about 25 square meters, with a height of 1.8 meters, which gives us from 28 to 32 persons standing in the space of each square meter! Among the list of the 34 historians, he will perhaps have noticed that there is but a single specialist of the history of the camps. In the bibliography list, he will have twice come across the name of Olga Wormser-Migot for secondary works but not for her thesis, doubtless considered dangerous; and he will not have found any book or any article devoted to the "gas chambers," for the good reason that, on the official side, there is none, neither in French nor in any foreign language (in this regard, beware of certain deceptive titles!).

The *Le Monde* reader is told of an account of the "final solution to the Jewish question" dated January 20, 1942. One may well wonder why the text of this account is not called by its name, as is normally the case: "Wannsee Protocol." I observe that, for some time, it has been realized that these strange minutes (for the word "Protocol" is a misnomer) are full of oddities and that they lack any guaranty of authenticity. They were typed on ordinary paper, with no indication of the place or date it was written, no indication of its origin, no official letterhead,

no reference, no signature. That said, I think that the meeting of January 20, 1942, did take place, and that it dealt with "the solution, at last, of the Jewish problem," which is to say that, as their emigration to Madagascar had been made impossible by the war, it was decided to expel the Jewish populations to the East of Europe.

Whoever bases any accusation at all on the Gerstein "document" (PS-1553) shows, by so doing, proof of an inability to find a solid argument for the existence of the "gas chambers." Not even the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg cared to exploit this text, which had emerged from its archives. Other tribunals, it is true, have been content to use it. The confession by R. Höss is not worth any more. I shall not go back over the matter of this "confession," drafted under the surveillance of his Polish and Soviet jailers. The least effort of analysis shows its fabricated nature; on this point I refer the reader to the works of Paul Rassinier and, in particular, to his study of the Eichmann trial (*Le Véritable Procès Eichmann*). As for Kremer's diary, written during the war, it is genuine, but certain meanings are abusively coaxed out of some passages, or indeed the text is twisted in order to have us think that Kremer is speaking of the horrors of the "gas chambers" where, in reality, he describes the horrors of a typhus epidemic. After the war Kremer, indeed, did confess what he was led to confess, in accordance with all the stereotypes of the confession specialists. I am rebuked for having hidden this confession. I have not hidden it. I have expressly mentioned the existence of these "confessions." I have not analyzed the text because, quite simply, my opponents have felicitously refrained from presenting it to me as evidence of the existence of "gas chambers" at Auschwitz! When Kremer speaks of three women being shot, I am willing to believe him. It could happen, I think, that a convoy of 1,710 persons contained three who were to be shot on arrival, at Auschwitz. But when Kremer, after the war, tells us that the incident involved women who had refused to enter the "gas chamber," I believe none of it. I need only go back to what he claimed to have seen of an alleged gassing operation, observed from his car. Kremer is among those people according to whom the reopening of the "gas chamber" was carried out "a moment" after the victims' death.[15] I have already shown that this is a material impossibility. And then, I note that, in an attempt to explain one confession, Kremer's, another confession is relied upon, that (as chance would have it) of Höss. The disturbing point is that these two confessions, both obtained by Polish military justice, contradict one another much more than they uphold one another. One should take a close look at their respective descriptions both of the victims and the surroundings, and of the executioners and the mode of execution.

In this photograph, taken in May or June 1944, Birkenau crematory building (*Krema*) II can be seen the background. In the foreground are Jews who have just arrived at the camp from Hungary. At no time were Birkenau's *Kremas* ever hidden or concealed. They were in plain view, and even newly arriving Jews could easily see them. As Prof. Faurisson pointed out in a letter published in *Le Monde*, January 16, 1979, the Birkenau *Kremas*, where hundreds of thousands of Jews were alleged killed in gas chambers in 1943 and 1944 as part of a top secret program, "were perfectly visible to all."

I do not understand the reply made in regard to Zyklon B. Used in a "gas chamber," it [hydrocyanic acid] would have stuck to the ceiling, to the floor, and to the four walls, and would have permeated the victims' bodies and their mucous for at least 20 hours. The members of the *Sonderkommando* (in fact, the crematory crew) charged with the task, it is said, of taking the bodies out of the "gas chamber" half an hour after the pouring in (?) of the Zyklon B, would have been instantly asphyxiated. And the Germans could hardly have scoffed at that, for the job would thus not have been done, and no new batch of victims could have been brought to the spot.

One must not confuse a suicidal or accidental

asphyxiation with an execution by gassing. In the latter case, those carrying out the job must avoid the least risk. Thus, the Americans, in order to gas a single prisoner at a time, use a complicated procedure in a small and hermetically sealed space. All movements are begun on the outside. The condemned man has his wrists and ankles bound and his head immobilized. After his death, the gas is extracted and neutralized, and the guards must wait more than an hour before entering the little enclosure. A "gas chamber" is not a bedroom.

For four years I have expressed the wish to debate publicly, with anyone whom the other side may care to name, "the problem of the gas chambers." I am answered with court writs. But the witchcraft trials, like the witch-hunts, never proved anything. I know of a way to move the debate forward. Instead of repeating ad nauseam that there exists an overabundance of evidence proving the existence of the "gas chambers" (let us be reminded of what this supposed overabundance was worth for the former Reich's — mythical — "gas chambers"), I suggest, in order to begin at the beginning, that my adversaries provide me with a proof, one single clear-cut proof, of the actual existence of a "gas chamber," of a single "gas chamber," Then we shall examine that "proof" together, in public.

— 'Right to Reply' letter of February 26, 1979, refused publication by *Le Monde,* responding to items in the issues of February 21, 1979 (p. 23) and February 23, 1979 (p. 40).

Notes

1. The phrase is that of Olga Wormser-Migot (*Le Système concentrationnaire nazi*, thesis published by the Presses Universitaires de France, 1968).
2. "Keine Vergasung in Dachau", by Dr. Martin Broszat, director of the Institute of Contemporary History in Munich (*Die Zeit*, August 19, 1960, p. 16). [Original text, in facsimile, and complete translation in English, in the May-June 1993 *Journal of Historical Review*, p. 12.]
3. On the one hand, photos from the Auschwitz Museum (negatives 519 and 6228), and, on the other hand, Nuremberg trial documents (NI-9098 and NI-9912).
4. See *The Work of the ICRC for Civilian Detainees in German Concentration Camps from 1939-1945*, (Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross, 1975) [French edition 1946] reproducing in part (I have a copy of the full confidential text) document No. 9925: "Visit by an ICRC delegate to the Commandant of Auschwitz Camp (September 1944)", pp. 76-77 [French edition, pp. 91-92]. A crucial sentence of this document was deftly truncated of three words in the book by Marc Hillel, *Les Archives de l'espoir* ("The Archives of Hope"), Fayard, 1977, p. 257, and the most important sentence ("The inmates themselves said nothing [about a gas chamber]") was simply left out.
5. Among the score of authors who refute the existence of the "gas chambers," I cite Paul Rassinier, wartime deportee (*Le Véritable Procès Eichmann* ... 1962), and, especially, the American A. R. Butz for his remarkable book on *The Hoax of the 20th Century.*
6. Presented to tourists as being in its original state.
7. *Auschwitz vu par les SS*, Auschwitz State Museum edition, 1974, p. 238, n. 85 [the English edition, *KL Auschwitz seen by the SS*, had been published in 1972.] [See also: R. Faurisson, "Confessions of SS Men Who Were at Auschwitz, Summer 1981, *Journal of Historical Review*, pp. 103-136.]
8. A soccer field "was located beside the Birkenau crematories" (Tadeusz Borowski, in the words of H. Langbein, *Hommes et femmes à Auschwitz*, Fayard, 1975, p. 129) [German edition: *Menschen in Auschwitz*, Vienna, Europa Verlag, 1972.]
9. French regulations concerning the use of hydrogen cyanide are as draconian as the German: see the Ministry of Public Health decree 50-1290 of October 18, 1950.
10. *Kommandant in Auschwitz*, Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1958, pp. 126 and 166.
11. *Justiz und NS-Verbrechen*, University Press Amsterdam, Band XIII (1975), pp. 134-135.
12. The general gullibility is easily satisfied: it is enough to show us a door fitted with a peephole and catch-bolted and there we have it: a "gas chamber"!
13. Louis Darquier de Pellepoix (1897-1980) was head of the Vichy government's Commissariat général des affaires juives ("General Office for Jewish Affairs") from May 1942 to February 1944. With the advent of "Liberation" and the subsequent *Épuration* (purge), he fled to Spain, where he lived until his death. In 1978, some French journalists, besieged with letters from Professor Faurisson and sensing that an "affaire Faurisson," which had been lying quiet like live coals since July 1974, threatened eventually to flare up, decided to make a firebreak. One Philippe Ganier-Raymond, a journalist and part-time swindler (previously held liable by a Paris court, with the aid of Faurisson, for literary fraud concerning a text written by Céline), got in on the act. In October of 1978, in the weekly *L'Express*, he published an alleged interview with Darquier de Pellepoix in which the latter was quoted as stating that at Auschwitz only lice had been gassed. As a result, Faurisson ended up seeming, a few weeks afterwards, like the twin of a notorious wartime collaborator. [Note by translator S. Mundi.]
14. The fact that some deportees were not registered at Auschwitz, as could well be expected, does not signify that those deportees disappeared or that they were "gassed." For more details on this point, see S. Klarsfeld, *Le Mémorial de la déportation des Juifs de France*, Paris, 1978, p. 10 and 12.
15. *Justiz und NS-Verbrechen*, University Press Amsterdam, Band XVII (1977), p. 20.

At Last ...

A full-scale debate on the Holocaust!

A terrific introduction to the hottest, most emotion-laden controversy of our time!

The Holocaust Story in the Crossfire: The Weber-Shermer Holocaust Debate

You'll be amazed as Occidental College professor Michael Shermer squares off against *Journal* editor Mark Weber in this unforgettable clash of wits on the most politicized chapter of 20th century history.

Shermer, just back from an inspection of the sites of the wartime concentration camps of Auschwitz, Majdanek, Mauthausen and Dachau, cites a "convergence of evidence" in his defense of the Holocaust story.

Weber, Director of the Institute for Historical Review, delivers a powerful summary of the revisionist critique of the Holocaust story, and gives a devastating response to Shermer's arguments.

Shermer, editor-publisher of *Skeptic* magazine, makes one startling concession after another. He acknowledges that numerous Holocaust claims — once "proven" by eyewitnesses and courts — are obviously not true. Shermer concedes, for example, that an execution "gas chamber" at Majdanek — shown to thousands of trusting tourists yearly — is a fraud. (At Nuremberg the Allies "proved" that the Germans murdered *one and half million* people at this one camp.)

This two hour clash — at a special IHR meeting on July 22, 1995 — dramatically gives the lie to the often-repeated claim that the Holocaust story is "undebatable."

The Holocaust Story in the Crossfire: The Weber-Shermer Holocaust Debate

Quality VHS color video • 2 hours

$21.95 postpaid (CA sales tax $1.55)

Add $1.00 for foreign shipping

Institute for Historical Review

P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

From Its Beginning, Israeli Policy Promoted War, Not Peace

DONALD NEFF

On May 14, 1948, Britain ended its mandate over Palestine and Jews declared the establishment of Israel. General Sir Alan Cunningham, the British High Commissioner in Palestine, felt on his departure an "overwhelming sadness ... Thirty years and we achieved nearly nothing."[1]

In fact, he and many other Britons felt considerable bitterness toward the Jews. Since the end of World War II, Britain had lost 338 citizens at the hands of Jewish terrorists.[2] Ahead was a half-century of bloodletting.

First there came an attempt by the Jews to complete the ethnic cleansing of Jerusalem. As the British withdrew, Jewish troops completed their occupation of most of southern and western Jerusalem, popularly known as New Jerusalem.[3] Reported Pablo de Azcarate, secretary of the Consular Truce Commission:[4]

> Hardly had the last English soldier disappeared than the Jews launched their offensive, consolidating their possession of Katamon which they occupied two weeks before and seizing the German Colony and the other southern districts of Jerusalem. The last remaining Arabs were liquidated, and from henceforth, the Jews were absolute masters of the southern part of the city.

One Palestinian resident, Naim Halaby, reported "an orgy of looting" by Jews. He saw "one group bring a horse and a cart up to his next-door neighbor's abandoned home and systematically strip it bare. Down the street other looters carried away tires, furniture, kerosene and heaps of clothing from another house."[5]

Arabs *living in* West Jerusalem accounted for more than half of the Arabs in the city, between 50,000 to 60,000 of the 101,000 total in 1948. They were undefended and either fled or were killed, leaving behind only those residing inside the Old City and three nearby districts. Jewish troops tried to capture the Old City — they attacked Jaffa Gate, Damascus Gate, New Gate, Nebi Daoud Gate — but failed to penetrate them.[6]



Donald Neff

When the fighting for Jerusalem finally stopped in the autumn, Israeli forces occupied 12 of the 15 Arab districts in new, western Jerusalem: Deir Abu Tor, Greek Colony, German Colony, Katamon, Lower Bakaa, Mamillah, Musrarah, Nebi Daoud, Sheikh Bader, Sheikh Jarrah, Talbieh and Upper Bakaa. No Palestinians were left. The conquest of these Arab districts provided Jewish immigrants with some 10,000 homes, most of them fully furnished.[7]

Indicative of how the demographics of Jerusalem changed was the ratio between Jews and Arabs over the next two decades. The Jewish population increased from 99,690 in 1947 to 194,000 in 1967, while the Arabs went from 50,000 to zero in Jewish West Jerusalem and from 50,000 to 70,000 in the Old City and its environs.[8]

Proclamation of Independence

At 4 p.m. local time in Tel Aviv, on May 14, 1948, David Ben-Gurion read the proclamation of independence, declaring the birth of Israel as of midnight.[9]

Although Ben-Gurion's proclamation promised in soaring words freedom and justice for all, there was no mention made of the United Nations Partition Plan's call for creation of an Arab state, nor the extent of Israel's borders. The question of Israel's borders went to the heart of the kind of country Israel would be — whether a peaceful state content with its size mandated by the world community or an expansionist Zionist state determined to wrest away the Palestinians' land.

The Jews chose expansion. Two days before declaring independence, the Provisional State Council, the Jewish pre-state government, had voted 5 to 4 not to mention borders. As Ben-Gurion had argued: "If the UN does not come into account in this matter, and they [the Arab states] make war

---

Donald Neff has written several books on US-Middle East relations, including the 1995 study, *Fallen Pillars: U.S. Policy Toward Palestine and Israel Since 1945*, and his 1988 *Warriors* trilogy. This article is reprinted from the May-June 1998 issue of *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* (P.O. Box 53062, Washington, DC 20009).

against us and we defeat them ... why should we bind ourselves?"[10] It was an artful way to say the Jews should grab as much land as they could.

It is clear from its inception that Israel chose to be not only expansionist but also repressive of the Palestinians. In its declaration of independence, Israel adopted "the legal system prevailing on May 14, 1948," including the British Defense (Emergency) Regulations.[11] These laws numbered over 160 decrees promulgated by Britain in 1945 to put down Jewish terrorism and gave authorities the right to expel suspects, detain them without trial, restrict their movements, destroy their homes and other extralegal powers.[12]

The martial law regulations gave Israel unfettered power over the 160,000 Palestinians living under Israeli control.[13] When Britain originally imposed the regulations, the Jews had been furious and charged London with inhumanity. Dr. Bernard Joseph, later Israeli Minister of Justice Dov Yosef, called them "terrorism under official seal." Yaakov S. Shapira, Israel's future attorney general, said: "The regime created by the Emergency Regulations is without precedent in a civilized society. Even Nazi Germany had no such laws ... Only one kind of system resembles these conditions — that of a country under occupation."[14] Menachem Begin called the regulations "Nazi laws" and vowed not to obey them, although he had no complaint about them when Israel later used them against the Palestinians.[15]

Martial Law

Israeli writer Tom Segev explained:[16]

> Martial law was initially instituted to prevent the return of refugees, or "infiltrators," as they were called, and to prevent those who had succeeded in crossing the border from returning to their homes ...

The second role assigned to martial rule was to evacuate semi-abandoned neighborhoods and villages as well as some which had not been abandoned — and to transfer their inhabitants to other parts of the country. Some were evacuated from a "security cordon" along the borders, and others were removed in order to make room for Jews. The third function of martial rule was to impose political supervision over the Arab population. In the process, the Arabs were isolated from the Jewish population.

The regulations were used to rule over Israeli Palestinians until 1966 when martial law was finally declared ended.[17] Since then Israel has found even more imaginative laws to enforce its occupation.

As for expansionism, Israel's actions said more than any proclamation could. When the 1948 fighting ended, Israel held 8,000 square miles, equal to 77.4 percent, of the 10,434 square miles of Palestine's land. Under the UN Partition Plan of 1947, it had been apportioned 56.47 percent even though its population was only half of the Palestinians'.[18]

Surely it was no accident — certainly not the "miraculous" event that Israel's first president, Chaim Weizmann, claimed[19] — that nearly two-thirds of the original 1.2 million Palestinian population was displaced and turned into refugees. Under Israeli pressure they fled their homes and businesses and Israelis took them over, enormously simplifying the task of establishing a new state. The value of immovable property left behind by the Palestinian refugees has been estimated at $4 million to $80 million in 1947 terms, to as high as seven times that amount.[20] This massive loss was the reason that the war became known to Arabs as the *nakba* — the Catastrophe.[21]

Israel completed its conquest of Palestine with the capture of the entire area in 1967, including Syria's Golan Heights. Since then, it has also taken over southern Lebanon and refuses to this day to surrender it as it does the Golan Heights and much of the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

Suppression of the Palestinians and conquest of Arab land was a formula for war, not peace. And that was what Israel got for the next half century — and will continue to court until it allows the Palestinians their freedom and the Arabs their land.

Recommended Reading

Abu-Lughod, Ibrahim (ed.), *Transformation of Palestine* (2nd ed.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1987

Azcarate, Pablo de, *Mission in Palestine, 1948-1952*. Washington, DC: Middle East Institute, 1966

Bar-Zohar, Michael, *Ben-Gurion: A Biography*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1978

Ben-Gurion, David, *Israel: A Personal History*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1971

Ben-Gurion, David, *Israel: Years of Challenge*. Jerusalem: Massadah-P.E.C. Press, 1963

Bethell, Nicholas, *The Palestine Triangle: The Struggle for the Holy Land, 1935-48*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1979

Cattan, Henry, *Jerusalem*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981

Collins, Larry, and Dominique Lapierre, *O Jerusalem!*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972

Davis, Uri, and Norton Mezvinsky, *Documents from Israel 1967-73: Readings for a Critique of Zionism*. London: Ithaca Press, 1975

Epp, Frank, H., *Whose Land is Palestine?*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1974

Flapan, Simha, *The Birth of Israel: Myths and Realities*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1987

Forsythe. David P., *United Nations Peacemaking: The Conciliation Commission for Palestine*, Baltimore:

The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972

Karp, Yehudit, *The Karp Report: Investigation of Suspicions Against Israelis in Judea and Samaria*. Jerusalem, Israeli Government, 1984

Khalidi, Walid (ed.), *From Haven to Conquest: Readings in Zionism and the Palestine Problem until 1948*. Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies (2nd printing), 1987

Laqueur, Walter, and Barry Rubin (eds.), *The Israel-Arab Reader*. New York: Penguin Books (revised and updated ed.), 1987

Lustick, Ian, *Arabs in the Jewish State: lsrael's Control of a National Minority*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980

Morris, Benny, *The Birth of the Palestine Refugee Problem*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987

Nakhleh, Issa, *Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem* (2 vols.). New York: Intercontinental Books, 1991

Quigley, John, *Palestine and Israel: A Challenge to Justice*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990

Sachar, Howard M., *History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*. Tel Aviv: Steimatzky's Agency, 1976

Segev, Tom, *1949: The First lsraelis*. New York: The Free Press, 1986

Shipler, David K., *Arab and Jew: Wounded Spirits in a Promised Land*. New York: Times Books, 1986

Tannous, Izzat, *The Palestinians: A Detailed Documented Eyewitness History of Palestine under British Mandate*. New York: I. G. T. Company, 1988

Notes

1. Collins and Lapierre, *O Jerusalem!*, p. 13.
2. Bethell, *The Palestine Triangle*, p. 360. The text of Britain's withdrawal statement is in *The New York Times*, May 14, 1948. The text includes a history of Britain's policy during the Mandate.
3. Azcarate, *Mission in Palestine 1948-1952*, p. 43.
4. Azcarate, *Mission in Palestine,* p. 43.
5. Collins and Lapierre, *O Jerusalem!*, p. 412.
6. Tannous, *The Palestinians*, pp. 565-67.
7. Cattan, *Jerusalem*, pp. 51, 61.
8. Cattan, *Jerusalem*, p. 63.
9. Text of the proclamation is in *The New York Times*, May 15, 1948; Laqueur and Rubin, *The Israel-Arab Reader*, pp. 125-28; Ben Gurion, *Israel*, pp. 79-81.

   A total of 37 Jews attended the Tel Aviv independence meeting. Arab critics charged their action had no binding legal force in international law because they represented a minority population and only one of them had been born in Palestine; the others were from European countries. Declared Palestinian scholar Issa Nakhleh: "The Jewish minority had no right to declare an independent state on a territory belonging to the Palestinian Arab nation." See Nakhleh, *Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem*, p. 4.
10. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion*, p. 161. Also see Flapan, *The Birth of Israel*, pp. 34-36, for a detailed examination of early Israeli territorial intentions.
11. Ben Gurion, *Israel: Years of Challenge*, p. 43.
12. Quigley, *Palestine and Israel*, p. 102. Quigley points out that the British had rescinded the emergency relations just before their departure, so strictly speaking Israel did not adopt them. A selection of the regulations can be found in Karp, *The Karp Report*, Appendix II, pp. 65-84.
13. Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State*, p. 49.
14. Segev, *1949*, p. 50. Also see James J. Zogby, *Palestinians: The Invisible Victims* (American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, 1981), p. 32, and Rabbi Elmer Berger, "A Critique of the Department of State's 1981 Country Report on Human Rights Practices in the State of Israel," Americans for Middle East Understanding, undated.
15. Segev, *1949*, p. 5On.
16. Segev, *1949*, p. 52.
17. Lustick, *Arabs in the Jewish State*, p. 123.
18. Epp, *Whose Land is Palestine?*, p. 195; Sachar, *History of Israel*, p. 350. For details of Israel's plans for occupying Palestinian territory, see Khalidi, *From Haven to Conquest*, pp. lxxv-lxxxiii, 755-61. For an excellent study of Jewish land ownership, see Ruedy in Abu-Lughod, *Transformation of Palestine*, pp. 119-138. Also see Davis and Mezvinsky, *Documents from Israel 1967-1973*, pp. 43-54; Morris, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem*, pp. 155, 179; Nakhleh, *Encyclopedia of the Palestine Problem*, pp. 305-45; Shipler, *Arab and Jew*, pp. 32-36; Segev, *1949*, pp. 69-71.
19. Sachar, *History of Israel*, p. 439.
20. Forsythe, *United Nations Peacemaking*, pp. 117-19.
21. Walid Khalidi, "The Palestine Problem: An Overview," *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Autumn 1991, p. 9.

They Would Shake Their Heads

"The process of 'coming to grips with the past' [*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*] has not gotten very far in Japan, and today the trend is rather in the other direction. Why haven't the Japanese been able to come to grips with their [World War II] past as the Germans have? The answer is simple ... How would the neighboring Asian countries ... react if a Japanese politician, for example, were to call the day of the Japanese capitulation — August 15, 1945 — a day of liberation [as German President Richard von Weizsäcker did]. The neighboring countries would probably laugh him away or strongly protest, and the Japanese themselves, without exception, would shake their heads."

— Tan Minoguchi, Japanese writer, in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (Munich), Issue No. 157, 1999. Quoted in *Nation + Europa* (Coburg), March 2000, p. 19.

Made-for-TV Movie More Fair than the 'War Crimes' Trial It Depicts

"Nuremberg" (television drama miniseries). Based on the book *Nuremberg: Infamy on Trial*, by Joseph E. Persico. Screenplay by David Rintels. Produced by Alec Baldwin, Jon Cornick, Gerry Abrams, Suzanne Girard, and Peter Sussman. Directed by Yves Simoneau. Turner Network Television (TNT). Actual running time: 180 minutes (four hours with commercials, in two parts). First segment premiere Sunday, July 16; conclusion premiere Monday, July 17. Web site: http://www.tnt.turner.com/movies/tnt-originals/nuremberg/frame_main_exclude.html

Reviewed by Greg Raven

Critics of the International Military Tribunal, and its trial of Third Reich leaders held in Nuremberg after the Second World War, believe it was illegitimate because of its application of *ex post facto* laws, use of questionable evidence and false testimonies, mistreatment of defendants and witnesses, and hindrances to defense attorneys. (See Mark Weber. "The Nuremberg Trials and the Holocaust," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1992), Despite these serious failings, the judgments rendered at the IMT, and at numerous follow-up German war crimes trials, largely shape the modern view of the war. The IMT has achieved such currency that most accounts of its proceedings and verdicts blindly perpetuate the unfairness of the trial itself, with little fear that repeatedly pointing out its flaws will invalidate or even tarnish this progressive standard.

It must be remembered that even documentaries produced by Hollywood are often so far removed from the truth as to be highly misleading, and TNT's made-for-television production of "Nuremberg" is not a documentary, but a drama. As such, it takes considerable license with the facts. Because there is little pretense here that history is being presented as it actually happened, it would be a waste of time to closely compare "Nuremberg" to the historical record.

More important is what is shown in addition to the seemingly obligatory Nazi-bashing common in films dealing with this era. For example, any mention of Adolf Hitler, Nazis or Nazism without harping on the Holocaust is inconceivable, and "Nuremberg" does its share of perpetuating the myth that the trials were necessary, fair, and unremarkable in terms of jurisprudence, largely because of what is alleged to have happened in the German-run concentration camps. But where most sympathetic treatments of the IMT differ only in their attempts to excuse its extra-legal aspects, TNT's "Nuremberg" naively acknowledges its unfairness, as if to say that the ends (the condemnation of Nazism and the punishment of Nazi leaders) justify the means.



Alec Baldwin played Robert Jackson, chief US prosecutor at the Nuremberg Tribunal, in the TNT made-for-television miniseries "Nuremberg." At the left is Jill Hennessy, who played Jackson's secretary, Elsie Douglas.

What's more, some of the accused, notably *Reichsmarschall* Hermann Göring (Brian Cox), are convincingly portrayed as men with some depth of character, a complete departure from the typical "Nazi = evil incarnate" formula found in most British and American films made since 1933. Although no doubt unintended, the nuances in "Nuremberg" set it apart from nearly all other mainstream treatments of the IMT.

"Nuremberg" establishes right away that the German leaders initially did not expect to be charged as criminals for conduct that up until then had been considered normal behavior by governments, and that many of their Allied counterparts considered it distasteful to turn over for trial men

Letters

Thoughts on the Irving-Lipstadt Trial

Your analysis of Judge Gray's decision in the Irving-Lipstadt trial [March-April 2000 *Journal*, pp. 2-8] is brilliant, and could well serve as an outline for Irving's appeal. Based on my own close reading of the trial transcript, as my years of experience as a lawyer, I'd like to chip in with a few comments.

Irving, as a loyal Englishman, seems to have had an unrealistic faith in the fairness of the British legal process. He could have benefited greatly from capable legal help, and I hope he has some to assist him in preparing his appeal.

Why, oh why, didn't Irving produce Germar Rudolf as a witness?

On the "conspiracy" angle, you are right in pointing out that Irving was never able to produce a "smoking gun," or even establish a real link to Lipstadt's book, which was, after all, at the core of his suit.

As Irving put it, Judge Gray's decision was "perverse." As you point out, on the record of this trial, any judge *could* have written a decision in Irving's favor. (To illustrate this point, I've toyed with the idea of writing such a decision myself.) Even on the existing record, in spite of its defects, I believe that a judgement for Irving was amply justified.

I was surprised at the many prejudicial interventions made by Judge Gray in the course of the trial. Numerous times he joined defense attorney Rampton in arguing against Irving. In doing so, he exhibited his own prejudices, which he "cleverly" acknowledged in his judgement while disingenuously claiming that he was able to set them aside in reaching a decision. I thought this very odd, and wondered if it is usual in British legal practice. Anyway, the Judge's prejudiced interventions could well be cited in an appeal.

A. D.
Florida
[by e-mail]

The 13th IHR Conference

Thank you for a dynamite Memorial Day weekend. The speeches by Faurisson, Rudolf and Graf were nothing less than stirring. The other talks were first class as well. I also appreciate the opportunity to renew old acquaintances.

You all are doing the work of God. Eventually there has to be a daybreak in this endless intellectual night.

E. B.
Dallas, Texas

I learned a lot at the recent IHR Conference, and met some very nice and interesting people. Thank you for the "student scholarship" help. I am a serious history student, and the Conference was a true blessing for me. To be quite honest, I realized just how much I didn't know, and how much more there is still to learn. I am looking forward to beginning work on my Master's degree, and the Conference really helped.

You all did a wonderful and very professional job. Thank you again for a great weekend.

D. W.
Fresno, Calif.

Congratulations on your excellent conference. It was very well organized and informative — very good for everyone's morale.

John Bennett
Carlton, Australia

Swastika Charm

Regarding the March-April 1999 *Journal* article about the swastika, and the remark [p. 34] that "in India it was revered as a sign of good fortune and prosperity," it is notable that such was also the case in the USA well into the 20th century. An example is seen in the 1931 Hollywood movie "Blonde Crazy." In the latter part James Cagney examines a two inch square metallic "swastika charm." The dialogue makes clear that Americans generally interpreted such a charm as a "good luck piece." (The title of the movie does not fit well. The original title, "Larceny Lane," was better.)

Arthur R. Butz
Evanston, Illinois

An Undeserved Honor

In December a group of "establishment" (that is, politically correct) historians and political commentators named Winston Churchill as the best British Prime Minister of the Century.

How an individual who was responsible for the criminal folly of the inadequately planned First World War Gallipoli campaign could even be considered for such an honor is beyond me. More to the point, Churchill, as First Lord of the Admiralty, was responsible for a similarly disastrous lack of thoughtful planning in Britain's ill-fated 1940 Norwegian campaign, a fiasco for which Neville Chamberlain was blamed and was accordingly replaced as Prime Minister by none other than Churchill himself. (See *The Nameless War* by Captain A.H.M. Ramsay.)

After the fall of France (June 1940), Hitler offered Britain very reasonable peace terms. He had even stopped his panzers from annihilating the British evacuating at Dunkirk as practical proof of the sincerity of his peace terms. But Churchill, who wanted the opportunity to regain his loss of prestige over the Gallipoli disas-

ter refused to consider peace — thus risking the lives of more millions. (See *Ten Days to Destiny*, by John Costello, and *The Nameless* War, by A. H. M. Ramsay.)

Churchill also permitted himself to come under the influence of the money power, which had bailed him out when his expensive lifestyle landed him heavily in debt. (See *Churchill's War*, by David Irving). Today the grip that the money power has on the world is a legacy left to us by the policies of Churchill and Roosevelt, for it is now fairly widely known that Roosevelt, aided and abetted by Churchill, provoked Japan into war in order to bring America in to help defeat Germany. Thus, in this all important game of divide and conquer, the money power won, and indeed the Western world, including Britain, has nothing to thank Churchill for.

S. A.
Caloundra, Qnsld.
Australia

Massive Historical Distortion

While we are inundated with "remembrance" of the greatest war crime that never occurred, the record of the greatest such crime that actually did occur are being expunged. I refer to the expulsion at the conclusion of World War II of twelve million Germans from the real east Germany — Silesia, Pomerania, East Prussia, the Sudetenland, and other areas east of the Oder-Neisse line — which involved the deaths of some two million people.

Then these lands, which constituted a quarter of Germany's territory, were incorporated by the Allied leaders into Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union. Although just as German as the rest of Germany, these regions had the geographic misfortune to be vulnerable to Allied, and especially Stalinist, vengeance.

With this great crime has come distortion of history on a grand scale. My 1986 edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (a work under the guidance of the University of Chicago) refers to east German cities as being "under Prussian control" until "liberated" by the Poles in 1945. A Maps of the war on the History Channel and on the boxes of model airplanes show postwar boundaries. An article in the neo-conservative magazine The *American Spectator* imagines a wartime event occurring in "Wroclaw" (Breslau). A few years ago Poles in the city of Stettin (Szczecin) celebrated the city's 800th anniversary. With the current Pope in attendance, they arranged the festivities as a celebration of their history. Even some Germans seem eager to eradicate their historical heritage and collective memory. During a visit to the Nietzsche house in Naumburg in 1998, I was startled to see the philosopher's life traced on wall maps not of his era, but of today.

Eric Rachout, M. D.
Moody, Texas

Fascinating and Helpful

I have been reading several of the articles on your web site. They are very interesting and challenging. After checking and cross-checking the source references, I find your site even more interesting! I've also been downloading and copying quite a few items from your site. Quite a few folks I know are fascinated by this material.

Your work, *The Zionist Terror Network*, is a great read. Absolutely fantastic. It will help greatly in adding color and detail to a novel I am writing. In this novel, I had referred to a mythical Zionist terror organization, but I did not dream that such a thing really existed until I read your material. Also very helpful is your article on Simon Wiesenthal.

Keep up the good work.

S. L. S.
[by e-mail]

Hard Documentation is Crucial

I have always felt that publicizing the truth about what really happened to Europe's Jews during World War II would be in everyone's best interest over time. Neither the various European governments nor the Jewish lobbies seem to concur, however. Instead, Jewish-Zionist groups have made a cash cow out of the Holocaust. In doing they have acted shamelessly and have denigrated their deceased brothers.

I believe that the only way that the truth about the Holocaust will ever force its way into the mainstream — barring an initiative by the German or American government — is through publishing hard documentation. The Auschwitz "Death Books" alone seem sufficient to force a change in perspective ["Pages from the Auschwitz Death Registry Volumes," Fall 1992 *Journal*], and I am at a loss as to why much more has not been made of them. In spite of their importance, certainly not one German, or American, in ten thousand has even heard of them.

R. G.
Whiteville, N. Carolina

Hard Evidence for Mass Famine in Ukraine?

In his letter in the Jan.-Feb. 2000 *Journal* ("Myths About Stalin and the Ukrainian famine, pages 70-71), J. C. M. makes the case for the existence of an imposed mass famine in Ukraine during the early 1930s in almost exactly the same way that mainstream historians make their case for "the Holocaust," and using similarly unreliable evidence. [This letter by J. C. M. is a response to an earlier letter by K. W., "One Sided Revisionism," in the Sept.-Dec. 1999 *JHR*, p. 71.]

J. C. M. claims that the Ukrainian famine is well-documented because several authors have written about it. That can also be truthfully said about the Holocaust.

He also cites Robert Conquest's estimate of 14.5 million deaths in the Ukrainian famine. In producing this "estimate," Conquest cooks data, makes unwarranted assumptions about birth rates, overlooks emigration and

population transfers, and ignores the unreliability of the era's population data. (The Soviet Union only instituted national ID cards in 1933, and there were no accurate population statistics until after the Second World War.) Holocaust historians use similarly dubious techniques to "prove" the six million figure.

Just as Holocaust historians can't come up with gas chambers, piles of bodies, or piles of cremated ashes, neither can Conquest, Solzhenitsyn or anyone else come up with real evidence that the Ukrainian famine ever took place.

J. C. M. cites "eyewitness" and "survivor" testimony. Similar testimony is used to prove "the Holocaust." Anecdotal evidence is notoriously unreliable and can easily be fabricated.

Real historians know that anecdotal evidence about a specific or localized incident cannot be extrapolated or generalized to determine the truth about a larger area or time period.

In the vast Soviet archival records that have been accessible for the past ten years, no evidence has been found for an imposed mass famine in Ukraine. It is also interesting to note that the records of the Gulag camps found in the KGB files show that there were never more than 2.5 million prisoners in the Soviet camps at any one time. (To put this in perspective, there are almost as many people imprisoned in the USA today.) The Soviet records also show that the death rates in the camps only exceeded ten percent during two years, 1942 and 1943, when supplies were understandably very short due to the war emergency. Parallels to Bergen-Belsen, Buchenwald and so forth, are obvious. (Source: "Lies Concerning the History of the Soviet Union," by Mario Sousa, in the Dec. 1999 issue of *North Star Compass* [a Stalinist monthly published in Toronto]. See www.northstarcompass.org.)

Revisionists should not be arbitrary or inconsistent, but should find a solid standard of evidence and stick with it. Revisionism should be applied to anti-Communist propaganda as ruthlessly as to anti-fascist propaganda.

K. W.
Phoenix, Arizona

Argentine Admirer

I am a great admirer of historical revisionism. I have read the book by Jürgen Graf, *El Holocausto Bajo La Lupa*. This is a really good, well documented work. As in so many countries, the "Holocaust industry" rules here. Anyone who says "What six million?" can be punished as a heretic.

G. I.
Buenos Aires, Argentina

We welcome letters from readers. We reserve the right to edit for style and space. Write: Editor, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA, or e-mail us at editor@ihr.org

Through North Africa with the Desert Fox

With Rommel in the Desert

by Heinz Werner Schmidt

No episode in modern warfare can match drama and romance of the 1942-1943 North African campaign, in which its undisputed hero, even for his British adversaries, was German commander Erwin Rommel. For nearly two years, outnumbered and undersupplied, the "Desert Fox" led his celebrated Afrika Korps to one brilliant victory after another, until he was finally overwhelmed by the sheer weight of men and materiel of the combined forces of Eisenhower and Montgomery (who were enormously aided by their ability to intercept secret German battle plans).

Serving at Rommel's side throughout his desert campaigns was the book's author, his South African-born Aide-de-Camp. Schmidt was with the legendary General from his first victories at El Agheila and Abedabia, in triumph at Tobruk, and in defeat before El Alamein. Dispensing with the larger-than-life image of propaganda and legend, the author provides a close-up portrait of Rommel the officer and Rommel the man as he confronts the challenges of a new kind of warfare in a harsh, unforgiving environment. This first-hand account puts the reader at Rommel's side as he bends over battle maps in his command tent, planning a new attack or anticipating the next enemy onslaught.

Written with dry humor and warm human sympathy for the soldiers of all sides, the author provides a detailed, objective account of Rommel's desert campaigns. More than that, he takes the reader bounding across the Libyan desert in a Panzer outside Tobruk, dining on fresh-shot gazelle in the north African desert, and dodging rifle bullets and tank shells in dozens of engagements from Egypt to Tunisia. "It is all here," commented the *Irish Press* on this a military classic, "the thrust and counter thrust, the stratagems and deceptions practised on great armies, the deadly surprises and in the end the wholesale and complete defeat."

With Rommel in the Desert

Quality Hardcover. 235 pages. Dust jacket. Photos. Maps. (#0169)
$12.95, plus $2.50 shipping

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

FIRST SUPPRESSED, THEN FORGOTTEN FOR SIXTY YEARS

Lothrop Stoddard's Sympathetic Report from Hitler's Wartime Reich



Twentieth-century America's most perceptive, influential, and prophetic writer on race — Lothrop Stoddard — spent four months in late 1939-early 1940 covering National Socialist Germany, as its leaders and its people girded for total war. Stoddard criss-crossed the Third Reich to observe nearly every aspect of its political, social, economic, and military life, and he talked with men and women from all walks of life, from Adolf Hitler, Heinrich Himmler, and Joseph Goebbels to taxi drivers and chambermaids.

The result — *Into the Darkness* — is not only a classic of World War II reportage, but a unique evaluation of Germany's National Socialist experiment. For Stoddard was no ordinary journalist. A Harvard Ph.D in history, the author of *The Rising Tide of Color* and other works that played a key role in the enactment of America's 1924 immigration act, fluent in German and deeply versed in European politics and culture, Stoddard brought to *Into the Darkness* a sophistication and a sympathy impossible for William Shirer and a myriad of other journalistic hacks.

To be sure, the New England Yankee Stoddard was no supporter of the Hitler dictatorship, but he was deeply interested in National Socialist policies, above all in the social and the racial sphere. Reading *Into the Darkness* brings you to hearings before a German eugenics court, to an ancestral farm in Westphalia, to the headquarters of the National Labor Service, to German markets, factories, medical clinics, and welfare offices, as keenly observed and analyzed by Stoddard. You'll read, too, of Stoddard's conversations with German policy makers in all fields: Hans F. K. Günther and Fritz Lenz on race and eugenics; Walther Darré on agriculture; Robert Ley on labor; Gertrud Scholz-Klink on women in the Third Reich; General Alexander Löhr on the Luftwaffe's Polish campaign, as well as Hitler, Himmler, Goebbels and many other leaders. And you'll travel with Stoddard to Slovakia, where he interviews Monsignor Tiso, the national leader later put to death by the Communists, and to Hungary, where the Magyars, still at peace, gaze apprehensively at Soviet Russia.

Into the Darkness (so named from the mandatory air-defense blackout that Stoddard found so vexing) shines a torch of sanity and truth against the vituperation of all things National Socialist that has been practically obligatory for the past sixty years. Knowledgeable, urbane, skeptical, and above all fair, Stoddard's book is a unique, an indispensable historical document, a time capsule for truth, and a stimulating page-turner for everyone interested in the Third Reich and the German people.

Into The Darkness: An Uncensored Report from Inside the Third Reich at War

Quality softcover. 311 pages. New Introduction. Index. (#0123)

$13.95 (shipping: $2.50 domestic, $3.50 foreign; CA sales tax: $1.08)

Institute for Historical Review

P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA

A Horrific, Suppressed Story

Revised, Updated Edition

"The events are vivid, the language is powerful, the conclusions appear just. The book should be read and become part of the all too gruesome document the world calls history."
– New York *Daily News*

In 1945 Poland's new Soviet-dominated government was actively recruiting Jews for its Office of State Security to carry out its own trademark brand of brutal "de-Nazification." The Office's agents raided German homes, rounding up some 200,000 men, women, children and infants – 99 percent of them non-combatant, innocent civilians. Incarcerated in cellars, prisons, and 1,255 concentration camps where typhus was rampant and torture was commonplace, the inmates subsisted on starvation rations. In this brief period, between 60,000 and 80,000 Germans perished at the hands of the Office.



An Eye for an Eye tells the little-known story of how Jewish victims of the Third Reich inflicted equally terrible suffering on innocent Germans. To unearth it, the author, a veteran journalist and war correspondent, spent seven years conducting research and interviews in Poland, Germany, Israel and the United States.

Author John Sack focuses on such figures as Shlomo Morel, a commandant who bragged: "What the Germans couldn't do in five years at Auschwitz, I've done in five months at Schwientochlowitz."

Not for 60 years has a book been so diligently (and, in the end, unsuccessfully) suppressed as *An Eye for an Eye*. One major newspaper, one major magazine, and three major publishers paid $40,000 for it but were scared off. One printed 6,000 copies, then pulped them. Two dozen publishers read *An Eye for an Eye* and praised it. "Shocking," "Startling," "Astonishing," "Mesmerizing," "Extraordinary," they wrote to the author, but all two dozen rejected it.

When it was finally published by Basic Books, it "sparked a furious controversy" *(Newsweek)*. And while it became a best-seller in Europe, it was so shunned in America that it also became, in the words of *New York* magazine, "The Book They Dare Not Review."

Since then, both *60 Minutes* and *The New York Times* have corroborated Sack's riveting expose of atrocities by vengeful Jews against German civilians in Communist-ruled Poland.

Completely revised and updated, this fourth edition includes 74 pages of reference citations and other source notes.

An Eye for an Eye

The Story of Jews Who Sought Revenge for the Holocaust

by John Sack

Quality softcover. 280 pages. Revised, updated fourth edition. Photos. Source notes. Index. (#0333)
$12.95 plus $2.00 shipping ($3.00 foreign; California orders add $1.00 sales tax)

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659 USA